THE PANJAB
PAST AND PRESENT

Vol. VIII, Part II October 1974 Serial No. 16

1. On Kuka's by Dr. Ganda Singh.
2. On Ramgarhia by S. Sunder Singh.

Edited by
GANDA SINGH

DEPARTMENT OF PUNJAB HISTORICAL STUDIES
PUNJABI UNIVERSITY, PATIALA



Sri Satguru Jagjit Singh Ji E-library

Sri Satguru Jagjit Singh Ji E-library has been created with the approval and personal blessings of Sri Satguru Uday Singh Ji. You can easily access the wealth of teaching, learning and research materials on Sri Satguru Jagjit Singh Ji E-library online, which until now have only been available to a handful of scholars and researchers.

This new Sri Satguru Jagjit Singh Ji E-library allows school children, students, researchers and armchair scholars anywhere in the world at any time to study and learn from the original documents.

As well as opening access to our historical pieces of world heritage, digitisation ensures the long-term protection and conservation of these fragile treasures. This is a significant milestone in the development of the Sri Satguru Jagjit Singh Ji E-Library, but it is just a first step on a long road.

Please join with us in this remarkable transformation of the Library. You can share your books, magazines, pamphlets, photos, music, videos etc. This will ensure they are preserved for generations to come. Each item will be fully acknowledged.

To continue this work, we need your help

Your generous contribution and help will ensure that an ever-growing number of the Library's collections are conserved and digitised, and are made available to students, scholars, and readers the world over. The Sri Satguru Jagjit Singh Ji E-Library collection is growing day by day and some rare and priceless books/magazines/manuscripts and other items have already been digitised.

We would like to thank all the contributors who have kindly provided items from their collections. This is appreciated by us now and many readers in the future.

Contact Details

For further information - please contact

Email: NamdhariElibrary@gmail.com

kirpal singh dhana

THE PANJAB PAST AND PRESENT

Vol. VIII, Part II October 1974 Serial No. 16

Edited by
GANDA SINGH

DEPARTMENT OF PUNJAB HISTORICAL STUDIES
PUNJABI UNIVERSITY, PATIALA

The writers themselves are responsible for the opinions expressed in their articles.

Published Twice a Year
April and October

Annual Subscription, I)
Foreign :)

Contributions to be sent to :
Dr Ganda Singh,
Lower Mall,
Patiala

Subscription to be sent to :
The Director,
Department of Punjab Hist. Studies,
Punjabi University, Patiala

Printed and Published by
S. Gurcharan Singh, Registrar, Punjabi University, Patiala,
AT THE PHULKIAN PRESS, PATIALA,
October, 1974

CONTENTS

A Note On
The Archives and Museum Department, Patiala and E.P.S. Union, Patiala
1954

The structure of the Archives Department of the Patiala and the East Punjab States Union has been raised on the old Records office of the Foreign Department of the erstwhile Patiala State, known as the Munshikhana. The Munshikhana record office, established in the early years of the 19th century, was in the charge of a Record Officer. On February 20, 1948, a new scheme for the re-organisation of the Record Office was sanctioned and it was renamed as the Archives Department, with Prof. S. N. Bannerji, the State Historian and Professor of History in the Mahendra College, as its first Director. The following staff was sanctioned and the administrative control of the Department continued to remain with the Foreign and Political Department as usual.

1. **Ministerial**			
Record Assitant	I	Rs.	125-10-175
Stenographer	1	,,	60-3-75
Senior Clerk	1	,,	50-4-70
Junior Clerk	1	,,	30-4-50
2. **Class iv**			
Menders	7	Rs.	20-1-25
Peon	1	,,	16/- p.m.
Dusting bearers	2	,,	15/- p.m.
Sweeper	1	,,	15/- p.m.

On the formation of the Patiala Union on August 20, 1948, the administrative control remained unchanged—the old Foreign and Political Department having been converted into Home Department—with the Chief Secretary as Secretary-in-charge.

Transfer of Armoury to the Archives.

Towards the end of 1949 the State Armoury, then called Museum by courtesy, was amalgamated with the Archives, and the post of the Curator of Museum then held by Major W.M. Hutton was abolished. This made the Director of Archives the Curator of Museum as well and added the following staff to the strength of the Department :

Gazetted

1. Assistant to the Curator of Museum	1	Rs. 100/- p.m. Allowance (post abolished in 1950)

Ministerial

1. Munsarim	1	Rs. 60-4-90
2. Storekeeper	1	Rs. 75/- p.m. fixed (post abolished in May, 1950)
3. Accountant	1	Rs. 75/- p.m.
4. Sikligars	6	Rs. 30/- p.m. fixed
5. Carpenter	1	Rs. 36/- p.m. fixed (post abolished in Sep. 1950)
6. Blacksmith	1	Rs. 36/- p.m. ,,
7. Mochi	1	Rs. 30/- p.m. ,,
8. Peons	2	Rs. 16/- p.m. each
9. Gate-keepers	2	Rs. 16/- p.m. fixed each

Scope and Functions

Before entering into details regarding the work and progress of this Department, it will be useful to give an idea of the scope of the functions of the Department and its existing strength.

A. Archives

(a) Records Section

i. Concentration of records of the constituent States and different departments of the Government.

ii. Checking, sorting, classifying and arranging of records.

iii. Servicing of records to meet the Government requisitions and supplying of copies to private individuals.

iv. Preparation of reference media, such as descriptive or press lists, hand-lists, hand-book, indices, catalogues and calendars.

(b) Preservation and Mending

Rehabilitating of brittle papers by mending, spraying, fumigation, etc.

(c) Reference Library

i. Collection and preservation of books, manuscripts, maps, etc., bearing on the history and culture of India in general and our part of the country in particular.

ii. Guiding research scholars and students of history in their historical studies..

iii. Holding book-festivals and exhibitions of manuscripts and rare and out-of-print books.

(d) **Publication** of books and brochures on historical and cultural subjects.

(e) **Regional Survey of Historical Records**

i. Search of records, books and manuscripts in places other than the Archives Department.

ii. Listing and cataloguing of the above for researchful studies.

B. Museum

(a) Organisation of a Museum and a Picture Gallery at the Capital.

(b) i. Compilation and publication of hand-book of the Central Museum and monographs on Museological subjects.

ii. Numismatic Studies of the State.

iii. Collection of Stamps for philatelic studies.

Staff

Gazetted

Director of Archives & Curator of Museum	1	Rs. 600-30-900
Record Officer	1	Rs. 250-25-400
	2	

Directorate

Stenotypist	1	Rs. 60-4-100 plus ,, 20, special pay
Routine Clerks	2	,, 60-4-100
Typist	1	,, 60-4-100
Accountant	1	,, 60-4-100
Peons	5	,, 20-1-25
Sweeper	1	,, 20/- fixed
Kahar	1	,, 20/- fixed
Chawkidar	1	,, 20/- fixed
	13	

Record Section

Temporary Routine Clerks	6	Rs. 60-4-100
Records Lifters	2	,, 30-1-35
File-fetcher	1	,, 40-2-60
Dusting-bearers	2	,,
	11	

Mending Section		
Head Mender	1	Rs. 40-2-60
Menders	6	,, 30-1-35
Library		
Librarian	1	Rs. 120-10-250
Library Clerk	1	,, 40-2-60
Peon	1	,, 20-1-25
Book-lifter	1	,, 30-1-35
Book-Binder	1	,, 40-2-60
Research Scholar	1	,, 100/- (Allowance)
	6	
Museum (Armoury)		
Munsarim	1	Rs. 60-4-100
Guide	1	,, 60-4-100
Gate-keepers	2	,, 20-1-25
Sikligars	6	,, 30/- fixed
Sweeper	1	,, 20/- fixed
Cleaner	1	,, 20-1-25
	12	
Jillokhana		
Munsarim	1	Rs. 60-40-100
Junior Clerk	1	,, 40-2-60
Cleaners	4	,, 20-1-25
Chawkidar	1	,, 20/- fixed
	7	
Durbar Hall		
Naib Tehvildar	1	Rs. 30-2-40
Cleaners	3	,, 20-1-25
Sweeper	1	,, 20/- fixed
Saqqa	1	,, 20/- fixed
	6	

Record Section

The establishment of the Union of Patiala and E.P.S. necessitated the concentration of the administrative, political and historical records of the constituent States at the capital. On receipt of Government orders under No. 1 (4) PR-06 dated 16.5.49, efforts were made for the transfer of these records to the central records office organized here

on the lines of the National Archives of India, New Delhi. This was done to facilitate official references to these records and to save them from damage and deterioration due to unsatisfactory storage conditions and the ignorance of record clerks regarding scientific methods of preservation. In fact, a good deal of record at Faridkot and Nalagarh was found to have been damaged by white ants, rain water, etc. The records noted below (in round figures) were collected and concentrated in this Department in the first instance up to March 1950.

Patiala	702,000
Nabha	60,000
Jind	65,000
Kapurthala	15,000
Faridkot	10,000
Malerkotla	10,000
Kalsia	8,000
Nalagarh	3,000
	8,73,000

At this stage the work of the Department was dislocated by the unfortunate explosion of May 1, 1950, wherein the Storekeeper-cum-Accountant of the Museum was killed and large quantitites of arms and ammunition were destroyed, together with most of the records of the Museum and Armoury workshop. In addition to it, the Department was robbed of most of its accommodation for records brought from out-stations, with the result that the arrangement, classification, listing and cataloguing of records came to a stand-still. The reconstruction of the building, the fitting of racks for records and the completion of other essentials took over two and a half years and it was in the beginning of 1953 that the building was finally handed over to us by the P.W.D.

The concentration of records, however, went on and the following records were added to the collections of the Department :—

1. **Patiala State**

Prime Minister's Office	17,492
Home Department	1,060
Finance Department	280
Education & Health Department	2,059
Economic Adviser's Office	250

	Army Department	1,592
	Chamber of Princes	6,292
	Ijlas-i-Khas	2,013
	Police (C.I.D.)	58
	D.P.I.	10,232
	Food & Supplies Department	25,624
	Law Department (Extradition Files)	5,652
II.	**Nabha State**	
	Revenue Department	152,231
	Development Deptt.	232
	Accountants Deptt. (Budget Files)	932
III	**Kapurthala State**	
	Saddar Records, Urdu	47,920
	,, English	2,732
	Confidential files	26
IV.	**Jind State**	
	Accounts Department	99
V.	**Faridkot State**	
	Army Department	232
		2,78,808

With these additions the total number of files registers, etc., has risen up to 11,51,808. This number is steadily increasing with new accessions of noncurrent records from different departments of the Government.

The earliest document available with us is a photographic copy of a letter of Guru Gobind Singh dated Bhadon 2, Samwat 1753 Bikrami, August 2, 1696 A.D., addressed to Bhai Tiloka and Bhai Rama, the ancestors of the Phulkian family. The original of it is preserved as a sacred historical relic in the Burj Baba Ala Singh in the Qila Mubarik, Patiala. In this letter the Guru blessed them with *Terā Ghar Merā Asai* (Your House is My Own) and called upon them to come to his presence with a detachment of horse, evidently, to prepare for defence against Prince Muazam (later on Emperor Bahadur Shah) son of Emperor Aurangzeb. The Prince at this time was moving towards the north and, under the orders of his father, intended, on his way, to supress the rising power of the Guru.

The entire records of (1) Faridkot (2) Jind (3) Kalsia (4) Kapurthala (5) Malerkotla and (6) Nabha States have been arranged and checked with lists or Registers of files.

Nalagarh Record : The English Records of Nalagarh have been checked and arranged, but the old files and *Sahīs* (account books) which are written in Pahārī (Takrā) script have yet to be gone through and arranged. Steps are being taken to employ a Pahari-knowing clerk for the purpose.

Patiala Records : Almost half of the old files of the Patiala State which form bulk of our record yet remains to be checked and listed.

The preliminary arrangement and listing of entire records are expected to be completed by the first half of the next financial year 1955-56.

Reference Media

As regards the preparation of hand-lists and a hand-book of records and other references media, such as index, calendar and catalogue for easy and ready reference by research scholars and others are on the programme of this Department. But it can be taken in hand only when the requisite staff is provided for the purpose.

It may be mentioned in this connection that an officer of the Department, Mr. Chhail Behari Lal, who has now been promoted to be a Record Officer, has been got trained at the National Archives of India, New Delhi, but the real object of his training can only be achieved when the allied proposal for providing Head Assistants for the office routine and technical work involved in preparing the said reference media is sanctioned by the Government.

Preservation

A regular Mending Section has been organized for rehabilitating old and brittle papers affected by time and damaged by white ants, silver fish, and other dangerous insects. Tissue paper, both glazed and unglazed, is generally used for mending papers, with the adhesive prepared according to the following formula :—

Dextrine	5 lbs.
Water	10 lbs.
Oil Cloves	1½ ozs.
Saffrol	1½ ozs.
White Arsenic	2½ ozs.

Muslin and shiffon are also applied where necessary. The folded papers are flattened with the Paper press and paginated.

In addition to routine and special dusting of records, books, manuscripts, etc., naphthelene balls and bricks and the insecticides

(Emcee) papers are freely used. Occasional fumigation is also done with thymil and paradichlorobenzine in big air-tight boxes, having perforated shelves. The leather preservation mixture is applied to leather-bound volumes.

Library

The Archives Library established in April 1950 is a necessary important adjunct of the Department. The Archives Department is generally a centre of historical and culture research, at least for the state to which it belongs. The students and scholars coming to it from outside expect, and should have at hand, when working on records in connection with their researches, all reference books and supplementary works for comparison and coordination. And these, they have here.

To begin with, the Government sanctioned a sum of Rs, 5,000 for the first year for purchase of books, etc., reducing it later on to Rs. 2,000 per annum. During the four years of its life the Library has made an enviable collection of manuscripts and rare and out-of-print books. The Persian, Sanskrit, Panjabi and Hindi manuscripts transferred from the Public Library at Sangrur, the Toshekhana Library at Kapurthala, the Public Library at Patiala, and other places have considerably added to its collection. A number of Persian manuscripts and books on history have been transferred to this Library from the Panjabi Department in addition to those received from the defunct Deodhi Mualla, Patiala, and the old Foreign Offices of Patiala and Nabha States.

To avoid all chances of loss of valuable, rare and out-of-print books and to make them readily available to scholars coming to the Archives at any time for study and examination of records, the books are not issued out of the Library and are to be consulted in the library itself.

The Archives collection of books is mainly devoted to historical and other allied subjects with particular reference to the country north and north west of Delhi, including the Panjab and PEPSU. The total number of books and manuscripts at present comes to 12,589 as per details given below :

Manuscripts

Persian, Arabic and Urdu	2965
Hindi and Sanskrit	679
Panjabi	497

	English	2	
	Misc.	2	
			4145
Printed			
	English	6030	
	Hindi, Sanskrit	234	
	Persian Arabic and Urdu	1802	
	Panjabi	333	
	Miscellaneous	45	8444
			12,589

A number of quarterly and monthly journals and other periodicals and gazettes of the PEPSU, the Panjab and the Central governments are also subscribed to for record and reference.

Book Festival

The Department has been able to enliven the cultural activities of the State by holding Book-festivals and exhibition of records, rare books, manuscripts, paintings and pictures. The first book festival was held in April 1952. Since then it has become an annual feature of the Department. The response of the public has been very encouraging indeed, and a large number of manuscripts and rare and out-of-print books were drawn out of private collections. These could not have come to light otherwise. Our exhibitions not only succeed in making a considerable number of local people book-minded but also in attracting from outside a fairly large number of students, scholars and other interested people. It may also be mentioned that documentary films of educative value are procured from Film Library of the Central Ministry of Education, New Delhi, on these occasions and their free shows create lively interest in the general public. To avail ourselves of all concessions and opportunities, the Department has become a regular member of the Audio-Visual Aid Section of the Ministry of Education, Government of India.

Regional Survey of Historical Records

In addition to records in the custody of Archives, a large number of records and manuscripts are lying scattered with private institutions and individuals. Some of them are of great historical importance. But as most of them are lying hidden in obscure places, far away from the knowledge and reach of students and scholars, their

utility and importance are practically lost to the nation. With a view to unearthing and listing and catloguing all such historical and other material, Regional Committee for the Survey of Historical Records has been set up at the suggestion of the Indian Historical Records Commission of the Government of India, of which the Director of Archives is a member. In the first instance district committees were appointed, but later on a Central Committee was constituted under the chairmanship of the Director of Archives with the Professors of History in the various colleges as members.

A cyclostyled questionnaire for collecting necessary data was supplied to the members and they proposed to start the work through the agency of History students of their respective colleges It is. however, a matter of regret that the plan has not been successful. The Department is, therefore, seriously considering the adoption of some other plan.

Research Work

The vast collection of books and manuscripts in the Reference Library coupled with administrative, historical and political records in the state provide an ample scope of research work for students and scholars of history. "Rules regulating Historical Research among Records in the Custody of Archives Department and Access of the Public Thereto" have been framed on the lines of the rules of the National Archives of India and other State Archives and published for the guidance and convenience of intending visitors. Scholars are provided with every possible facilitiy in their researchful studies. The records prior to 1901 A.D. have been thrown open to bonafide scholars for work in the Archives. To encourage research in history the Government have appointed a Research Scholar* in the Department. He is at present working on the *Life and Times of Raja Gajpat Singh of Jind* who had a very stormy career during the eventful days of the second half of the eighteenth century and whose exploits and achievements are still a sealed book to the students of the Indian history.

Publications

The publication of books and brochures on historical and cultural subjects is one of the important literary activities of the Department.

---

*Shri Ram Sahai Mathur, M.A., now Lecturer in History at Faridkot.

The work has been well begun with a 100-page illustrated book, *The Patiala and the East Panjab States Union—Historical Background,* which gives in brief the history of this part of the country up to 1948 when the Union was formed.

The next important publication is *A Bibliography of the PEPSU.* It has been compiled with a view to providing the students of history and culture with material available for research in these subjects. The books and manuscripts, and also important papers, have been arranged authorwise under different languages, giving the title of the book and the place and date of publication. In the case of manuscripts, the names of persons and institutions where they are available have also been given to help scholars locate them for consultation.

Other publications of this Department so far issued are :

1. Rules for Historical Research Among Records in the Custody of the Archives and Access of the Public thereto.
2. A Note on the Preservation of Records
3. A list of maps with the Archives Department.

The following are on the Publication Programme :

1. A Hand-list of PEPSU Records
2. A Hand-book of PEPSU Records
3. Selection from English Records
4. Calendars of Persian Correspondence
5. Reports and Diaries af Vakils
6. The Families of Note
7. Relations with the Marathas
8. Exploits of European Adventurers
9. Numismatic Studies of the PEPSU
10. Source books of local history
11. Treaties Engagements and Sanads of the Panjab and Patiala and the EPS Union

In addition to these, an account of the *Historical Places in the PEPSU* is under preparation. It will be an illustrated publication with brief notes on the places included therein. The publication of this book will help us revive the memories of its glorious past and place it on the cultural map of ancient India.

A Geographical Dictionary of the PEPSU is also under compilation. In addition to the location of a village or town and its thānā, tahsil, District and Patwari and Qunungo circles, it will show the names of

rivers, streams and hills nearby. It will also include a brief history of the village together with a list of monuments of historical and archaeological interest, with a record of inscription therein, and old mounds and ruins of anicent villages. This will not only be useful for administrative purposes but will also be helpful to the research students and scholars in their studies in the history and culture of this part of the country which has so far been neglected for want of guiding hints and references. This will be followed in due course by a *Historical Geography* of the region.

Regional Committee for the History of Freedom Movement

A Regional Committee of 10 members has been set up for collecting material for the history of the Freedom Movement under the chairmanship of Shri Ram Saran Chand Mittal, Speaker of the Legislative Assembly, with Dr Ganda Singh as Secretary. The intended publication, no doubt, will be of great historical value.

Indian Historical Records Commission, Research and Publication Committee and the Indian History Congress

The Director of Archives, PEPSU, has been a member of these all-India associations as a representative of the PEPSU Government since the year 1948 (In his personal capacity, the present Director has been a member of the Indian Historical Records Commission and Indian History Congress for over 16 years). The first two are set up by the Government of India. Resolutions passed at their sessions held from time to time have been mostly adopted and acted upon by the PEPSU Government. This Department also takes part in the annual historical exhibitions organized by the Indian Historical Records Commission.

National Committee of Archivists

The National Committee of Archivists has been recently set up by the Government of India for the purpose of furthering the cause of Archival science in general and the Archival needs of different states in India in particular. The Director of Archives PEPSU is one of the members of this committee.

International Council of Archivists, Paris

With a view to keeping in touch with affairs relating to Archival science both in India and abroad and common to all countries in the world, the Director of Archives PEPSU, has, with the approval of the Government enrolled himself as member of the International Council of Archivists, Paris.

Museum

The old armoury of the Aslāhkhānā (Museum) was placed under the Director of Archives on September 30, 1949 (Government Resolution No. XX dated 30th September, 1949). Later on the Sangrur Magzine, the Nabha Armoury and the Toshekhana at Kapurthala were amalgamated with the Museum. The Jilaukhana and Darbar Hall of the erstwhile Patiala State, along with their staffs were transferred to this Department on October 17, 1950 and March 1, 1951 (Vide Government Resolution No. XXXXVII dated 17th October, 1950 and No. 12 dated 1st March, 1951, respectively).

Armoury Section

The practice of depositing confiscated and country-made weapons by the Police in the State Aslahkhana was discontinued by the Government as per Home Department Circular No. HD. 12 (97) D/51 dated April 26. 1952, as a first step towards organising a Public Museum at the capital of the PEPSU. It was at the same time considered necessary to liquidate the huge stock of old as well as new arms and ammunition belonging to constituent States. A Pricing committee with the Inspector General of Police, Director of Home Guards and the Director of Archives as members was formed on 22nd November, 1950 (vide Home Department letter No. F. 13 (11), F. 06 dated 22. 11. 1950). The prices of arms and ammunition having been fixed and approved by Government, they were sold to license holders on permits issued by the Home Department as per details given below, fetching a sum of Rs. 2, 73, 644/- to the State exchequer: –

1.	Guns (single barrel)	126
2.	Guns (Double barrel)	202
3.	Guns (Muzzle loading)	3,500
4.	Bayonets	817
5.	Cartridges	1,18,648
6.	Gun-boxes	56

This still leaves a considerable number of weapons for which a clearance sale has been proposed.

There also exists a large number of swords. A committee consisting of Assistant Inspector-General of Police, the Deputy Commissioner, Patiala, and the Director of Archives was appointed on 21st July, 1953, under Home Department order No. HD. 12 (S-47) D/53 dated 21. 7. 1953, to fix their prices. These having been approved by the Government, the swords are now on sale with the Department.

Out of the stock of 29,448 saleable swords 997 of different categories have been sold up to the end of May, 1954, at Rs. 5,083/-.

With a view to clearing the armoury of its junk, a wagon load of hroken and unserviceable gun barrels was made over, free of charge, to the Ordnance Depot at Allahabad in September 1952 at the expense of the Indian Army Department. Steps are also being taken to dispose of the useless and damaged articles, scrap iron, etc., dumped in the armoury premises.

With the Darbar Hall and the Jilaukhana coming to the Archives and the transfer of a number of Museum pieces from Sangrur, Nabha and Kapurthala, our Museum has assumed the shape of a regular Museum.

The Armoury Section of the Museum possesses one of the finest collections of old arms in India and can be greatly helpful in the study of the gradual development of and improvement in offensive and defensive weapons and fire-arms. In additions to plain and spiked clubs and maces and battle-axes used against mail-clad and armoured soldiers in olden days, and bows and arrows of different types, there is large number of swords and daggers. Some of them are of great historical value. They include the swords and daggers of Guru Govind Singh, the Mughal Emperor Jahangir and Shah Abbas of Persia and of the ruling chiefs of the Phulkian and Ahluwalia houses. The collection of guns is fairly large, down from *rahkalās*, *zambūraks* and *jazāir* to the lastest *ghubārās* and guns of heavy calibre. There is an equally large variety of sporting and other guns and rifles. Among the multi-chamber pistols, there is one with twenty chambers.

Picture Gallery

Originally it was intended to convert the Darbar Hall into a Picture Gallery attached to the Museum. In fact the Darbar Hall with its massive structure, with high walls and a beautifully decorated roof, and sets of oil paintings and chandeliers, was already a tolerable Picture Gallery. No other building in Patiala is more suitable for the purpose. But the oil paintings have now been removed from this Hall at the instance of the Legislative Assembaly and are lying stored in a room of the Museum to be hung when the plan of the Picture Gallery is completed. The collection of other paintings, pictures, photographs, etc., has been taken in hand.

Jilaukhana

The Jilaukhana has on exhibition the State coach of Patiala, number of *haudās* and palanquins of different types, the 1910 and

1913 models of motor-cars, gold and silver trappings and ornaments of horses and elephants and marble busts of some of the Prime Ministers of Patiala. A magnificent glass fountain standing in the centre of the room is a thing of beauty. The fossillised head of an elephant is of particular interest to the fossiologists. Samples of forest and mineral wealth are also available there. The texydermic section has quite a representative collection of Jungle animals and birds of rare beauty and variety.

In order to reorganize the Museum, His Highness the Rajpramukh has been graciously pleased to offer his personal advice and guidance. He has, in fact, visited the premises for the purpose more than once. The services of Jagdish Nath, Assistant Architect, P.W.D., have been requisitioned to help us re-arrange exhibits. The whole plan materialising, the PEPSU will have a full-fledged Museum at the capital. Excepting the incomplete Picture Gallery, all other sections are open to the public during the working hours, and the number of daily visitors at times has gone up to 1604 and the monthly figure to 7438.

National Art Treasures Purchase Fund

This Fund has been started by the Governmet of India, Ministry of Education, for the purpose of establishing a central Museum at the capital of India and in reponse to an appeal from them, the Government of the Patiala and East Panjab States Union has donated a sum of Rs. 5,000/-. The Director of Archives and Curator of Museum, PEPSU, has been nominated on the General Council of the National Art Treasures Fund. A Regional Committee to locate and recommend museum pieces depicting art and culture of the PEPSU for purchase by the said fund has been formed. The personnel thereof is as under :

1. Sardar Bahadur S. Mohan Singh, Chairman, Public Service Commission, Patiala.
2. S. Bhagwant Singh Hari-Ji, Hari-Brijesh Bhawan, Nabha.
3. S. Tarlok Singh, Ex-State Artist (Panjabi Deptt.), Patiala.
4. Dr Ganda Singh, Director of Archives and Curator of Museum, Patiala.

Sd/- Ganda Singh,
Director of Archives
and Curator of Museum,
P.E.P.S.U.

Patiala,
June 14, 1954.

Recent Developments in Historical Method and Interpretation[1]

DR H. MONTGOMERY HYDE

We are probably all agreed on the merits and uses of history as a course of study and a branch of instruction – a discipline, as it is called – in an institution such as the Panjab University. The importance of history in the life of a community has been stressed by writers and others from Herodotus to our own times. In the words of the 17th century English lawyer and essayist, Francis Bacon, "histories make men wise." Very recently in Pakistan the point has been repeated and underlined by the Minister for Education, Mr. Habibur Rehman, when he opened the Tenth Session of the Pakistan History Conference at Rajshahi a few days ago.[2] Remarking that Pakistan is today passing through a period of national reconstruction, the Minister quite rightly emphasised the need for a proper interpretation and appreciation of the past, which is bound to be of immense value in the work of refashioning and moulding a new society. While he indicated the necessity of recording and analysing for the public benefit both the achievements and the shortcomings of the people inhabiting this land, Mr. Rehman added that the process does not really end there. The student should naturally start with the history of his own country; he must then extend his studies to neighbouring territories and finally to the remotest corners of the earth, because, to quote the Minister's words, "history connot be divided into watertight compartments and human civilization does not spring fully armed like Minerva from a single root."

Regarded from the strictly utilitarian point of view, the study of history affords an excellent training for a variety of callings, since what has been described as the historical approach enables human beings to understand, perhaps better than any other discipline, the public events, affairs and trends of their times. In the several branches of the

---

1. Inaugural Lecture deliverd by Dr H Montgomery Hyde, M A (Oxon), D. Litt. (Belfast), Profesor of History in the University of the Panjab, Lahore (Pakistan), in the Senate Hall of the University on 13th February, 1960.

2. *Pakistan Times*, 2 February, 1960.

public administration, particularly the foreign service and the intelligence departments of the police and the armed forces, where the collection, co-ordination and evaluation of information is of the greatest importance, the advantages of historical training are obvious. Similarly, in the particular fields of lawyers, journalists, broadcasters, teachers, librarians, curators of museums and social workers generally, the systematic study of history is invaluable. I would also include politicians among those who can benefit immeasurably in this way.

One of the most powerful arguments in favour of a historical education is surely provided by the example of Sir Winston Churchill, himself a brilliant and accomplished historian, whose previous preoccupation with history uniquely equipped him to tackle the immense problems confronting Britain and indeed the whole of the free world during the last Great War with a sympathy and a breadth of vision which must have been denied to some of his colleagues and contemporaries who never studied history critically and deeply. Sir Winston's intimate familarity with the pages of Gibbon and Macaulay left an indelible imprint on his own speeches and writings. More indeed than that. The example of his illustrious ancestor, the Duke of Marlborough, in leading the Grand Alliance which defeated the aggressive designs of the French King Louis XIV for the domination of Europe at the close of the 17 th century, undoubtedly influenced Winston Churchill as a public figure, Marlborough's dazzling career certainly inspired and guided Churchill in his role of leader of the British people and as the prime participant in the concerted action which eventually overthrew Hitler.

The object of the historian, whether he or she be teacher, research worker or writer— as I see it— is two fold : first, the ascertainment of the facts of past events; and secondly, the embodiment of those facts, together with such logical deductions and inferences from the facts as may be necessary to complete the perspective, in a coherent and readable narrative. The method by which the historian achieves this purpose also deserves study, for as Lord Acton, one of the greatest of Regius Professors of History at Cambridge, has observed, it is "method, not genius or eloquence or erudition, that makes the historian."[3]

3. Acton, *History of Freedom and other Essays*, 235.

In some ways historical method — the process of assembling and elucidating the evidence of the past —may be compared with the method employed in courts of law, the examination and cross-examination of witnesses, the advocacy of the counsel who represent the opposing parties to a suit, and the final summing up of the evidence by the judge. But there are important differences. The Court sees the witnesses face to face; their demeanour can be studied in the witness box where the credibility of their testimony may be shaken by cross-examination. However, the historian is almost entirely concerned with dead witnesses, that is with documentary accounts given by individuals, who cannot be put into the witness box and questioned orally on their parts in the events under discussion. Even in the relatively rare cases where an individual can speak as to events within his memory, if is remarkable how inaccurate his memory can be as to details and how vitally neceessary it is for the living eye-witness's version, which may be recalled long after the event to be checked against contemporarary written accounts.

The historian's task is both interesting and exciting, but it is far from easy. The most thorough application of historical method requires rigorous training and constant practice in the latest techniques. First of all, the historian must learn to investigate the truth about the past so that he is able to differentiate clearly between fact and probability; he must carefully compare and assess the evidence he has acquired after diligent and painstaking search; he must form an accurate estimate of human character and motives; he must be able to analyse cause and effect; he must be on his guard to withstand the temptation to interpret the facts of the past by the standards of the present; and he must endeavour to ascertain the philosophic basis of those facts—in other words, he must root out and examine in the searchlight of his workshop the political, social and economic ideas which have inspired and motivated human actions at any given period of history. Most important, he must always verify his sources. Above all, although he need not disguise his personal sympathies, he must be fair, an operation which he may sometimes find to be of Herculean difficulty. At any rate, he should always bear in mind that he is not an advocate pleading a cause but as far as he can be an impartial judge. Finally, he must cultivate the art of narrative, since his work, when it finds its way into prints, should sustain the reader's interest as well as adding to the stock of human knowledge.

I have mentioned the need for cultivating a spirit of impartiality

and objectivity in the teaching and writing of history. Let me take a concrete example of an important and controversial historical event, namely the decision to impose Western educational methods on the Indian people as embodided in Macaulay's famous Minute of 1835. "We must do our best to form a class who may be interpreters between us and the millions whom we goven," wrote Macaulay, "a class of persons, Indian in blood and colour, but English in taste, in opinion, morals and in intellect." In the light of its subsequent repercussions in the sub-continent, I suppose this may be regarded as one of the most momentous official Minutes ever written.[4]

Now you may be in basic disagreement with the policy, which was immediately reflected in the discontinuance of Persian as the language of the law courts and the introduction of English as a compulsory medium of instruction in all the state-aided schools. You may think, as you are quite entitled to do on careful consideration, that the lack of appreciation shown by Macaulay for native oriental learning and the sublime confidence in Western cultural superiority, which were expressed in his Minute, betoken a certain ignorance and want of imaginative sympathy. You may also condemn, or at any rate dissent from, the missionary zeal of successive generations of English and Anglo-Indian administrators, whose, duty it was to implement this declared policy of the British Raj. On the other hand, you m st remember that in the circumstances of those times English was the only language capable of giving the races of India a common tongue for communicating with each other as well as with the ruling body. It would have been condignly reprehensible to exclude the sub-continent at that period from contacts with the West by shutting English out of the native schools. Indeed the subsequent revival in native culture and learning owes not a little to these contacts with the literature and science of the West. As you are all aware, the promotion of Muslim education on modern lines began in the immediate post-1857 period with the work of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan and his liberal Aligarh school, who with official encouragement and support went far to reconcile Indian Islam with British ways, while at the same time resuscitating Muslim intellectual and literary traditions. Nor should we forget that the decision in favour of the English language rendered possible the subsequent introduction of scientific teaching and the spread of scientific knowledge in the sub-continent, not to mention the creation

4. Cited by Sir Arthur Bryant in his *Macaulay*, at p. 57.

of a distinctive civil service and legal code, which form the basis of administration to-day.

Incidentally, there has been no more enthusiastic protagonist of the study of history, both ancient and modern as well as of English language and literature, than that great Muslim patriot Sir Syed Ahmed Khan. This is what he had to say on the subject in the speech with which he inaugurated the Scientific Society of Aligarh in 1864 :

> "Looking at the state of my fellow-countrymen's minds, I find that, from their ignorance of the past history of the world at large, they have nothing to guide them in their future career. From their ignorance of the events of the past, and also of the events of the present,— from their not being acquainted with the manner and means by which infant nations have grown into powerful and flourishing ones, and by which the present most advanced ones have beaten their competitors in the race for position among the magnates of the world,—they are unable to take lessons and profit by their experiences. Through this ignorance, also, they aro not aware of the causes which have undermined the foundations of those nations once the most wealthy, the most civilized, and the most powerful in the history of their times, and which have since gradually gone to decay or remained stationary instead of advancing with the age."[5]

Are not these words as apt and true to day as when they were first uttered at Ghazipore nearly a century ago ?

I have said that history books need not be dull. Nor need they be confined within the strict limits imposed by the purely academic historian. Sir Maurice Powicke, a former Regius Professor of Modern History of Oxford and perhaps the most distinguished living English authority on the Middle Ages, has said that we need more public servants, more lawyers, more teachers and other professional men and women to engage in historical work. I agree with this opinion. But I also think that the converse holds good as well. In other words, it is good thing that the historian, whether he be writer or teacher or a combination of both, should have some practical experience of the world outside the library and the lecture room, particularly in the political field; for after all politics, when you come to think of it, are

5. G. F. I. Graham, *The Life and Work of Sir Syed Ahmed Khan*, 2nd Ed. (London, 1909), at pp. 52-53.

simply contemporary history or history as it is being made and enacted before our eyes. I believe that the exponent of history who has some extra-mural experience is better placed to interpret his subject than the colleague who has remained within the strict confines of documentary and printed records.

Apart from my old teacher, about whom I shall have something to say in a few minutes, the three historians who have influenced me and stimulated me more than any others in my own particular field of modern European political and diplomatic history, in regard both to their writings and the conversations I was privileged to have with them, were all men who amply fulfilled this qualification. They were Sir Charles Webster, the late Harold Temperly and the late Walter Alison Phillips. Professor Webster advised the British Foreign Office at the Versailles Treaty Conference in 1919 and also the San Francisco Conference in 1945, conferences from which emerged two significant experiments in international goverment, the League of Nations and the United Nations Organization. Professor Temperley also served in the Foreign Service for some years as Military Attaché in the British Embassy in Yugoslavia. On the other hand, Professor Alison Phillips, who belonged to an older generation and as a young man helped Lord Acton to plan the *Cambridge Modern History*, was Assistant Editor of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* and later special correspondent of the London *Times* newspaper in South America before beginning his long and distinguished occupation of the Lecky Chair of Modern History in the University of Dublin.

Fortunately my own experience has been cast in a wide range of extra-mural activities and interests. As an undergraduate and post-graduate student I had the advantage of being able to travel extensively in Europe, at a time when it was still comparatively inexpensive to do so, more particularly in France, Belgium, Spain, Germany, Austria, Scandinavia and Soviet Russia, and I spent many fascinating hours wandering through the palaces, museums, picture galleries and battlefields of these countries. Soon afterwards I was appointed librarian and a little later private secretary to the seventh Marquess of Londonderry, and in this capacity I found myself in charge of one of the most interesting private collections in Britain. At that time Lord Londonderry was a member of the British Cabinet : many years later I was to have the opportunity of recording his contribution to contemporary history in the latest volume of the *English Dictionary of National Biography*. Politics were in his blood, for he was descended

from the Lord Castlereagh, who was War Minister and Foreign Minister at the time of the Napoleonic Wars. Thus, while I was thrown into daily contact with a high minister of state and had the unusual advantage of seeing him at work in his daily official business, at the same time I lived in the atmosphere of his celebrated ancestor's age, sitting in the chair that Castelreagh used at the Congress of Vienna, where he was the principal British plenipotentiary, and reading the despatches which he drafted in his own hand on the very table where the main transactions of the Congress took place and on which the Treaty of Vienna was signed in 1815.

In due course I became a barrister, entered chambers in the Middle Temple, and began to follow my chosen profession in the law. This career was interrupted by the Second World War, but the interruption in my case was not altogether without profit, since I served as a military intelligence officer in the Mediterranean area and elsewhere over a wide field, and in the latter stages of the war became a legal officer in the allied military government of Austria, thus returning to the scene of some of my earlier historical researches in Vienna. After the war I resumed my practice at the English Bar, at the same time helping to edit the official Law Reports in London.

This somewhat protracted apprenticeship as a history professor was completed by my election as a Member of the British House of Commons, in which I sat for almost ten years. For some of that time I was also a United Kingdom delegate to the Council of Europe Consultative Assembly, that remarkable body of European parliamentarians which meets regularly at Strasbourg to devise measures for the common good of Europe. In the legislative processes of the House of Commons I have been privileged to play a small part, when I was lucky enough among other duties to be a member of the Standing Committees which reported upon two complex and detailed measures of considerable importance to the student of history. These are the Copyright Act, which preserves the right of certain libraries in Britain and Ireland to receive a free copy of every printed work published in the United Kingdom, and the Public Records Act which has reorganised the whole system of official departmental records in Great Britain, establishing among other innovations the rule that every official and semi-official document, including Cabinet Papers, save in a few exceptional instances, should be available for public inspection fifty years after their date of origin.

I apologise for this autobiographical digression But I feel it is a

necessary preliminary to the main purpose of what I have to say to you today. I will not weary you much longer with personal reminiscences. But I must just say a few words on my own student experience to round off the story.

It is close on thirty-five years ago that I began to read in the Honours School of Modern History in the university of my native city, the Queen's University of Belfast, in Northern Ireland. My Professor was a Scotsman, the late James Eadie Todd, who had graduated in history from Edinburgh University under the aegis of Sir Richard Lodge, before going on to Balliol College, Oxford, to continue his historical studies under Sir Charles Firth, the then Regius Professor. Besides being a highly stimulating teacher, Todd was a colourful lecturer in the grand manner, whose meticulous exposition and rigorous analyses of historical causes and effects illuminated the precise and systematic methods of study which he laid down for his pupils. As a special subject in the Honours School he invariably set the period of the Civil War in England in the 17th century, and there was no doubt on which side of the struggle his sympathies lay. Like every good historian, however, Todd believed in being impartial in his judgements, but that did not mean that he believed in being neutral. Thus, although he was a fervent admirer of Oliver Cromwell and the Parliamentary Party, he was always fair to the Cavaliers, and his lectures lost nothing in accuracy, while gaining much in graphic presentation.

It was Todd who encouraged me, when I was in my final year at the Queen's University, to try for an Open History Exhibition at Oxford. When Magdalen College duly elected me an exhibitioner, and I migrated from Belfast to Oxford, I decided to change over from history to law and to read in the Honours School of Jurisprudence there. As Todd seemed a little disappointed by my decision, I promised him to maintain my interest in history, and to this end he provided me with an introduction to the newly elected Regius Professor at Oxford, now Sir Maurice Powicke, whom I have already mentioned and who by an interesting coincidence had been Todd's predecessor in the Chair of History at Belfast.

When I presented myself to Professor Powicke, he invited me to come to his inaugural Lecture. This I remembered he delivered to a somewhat sparsely attended gathering in the Examination Schools building in Oxford on a cold February afternoon in 1929. But Sir Maurice Powicke, as he now is, was well worth hearing on that occa-

sion, since he addressed himself particularly to the subject of historical study in Oxford. I should like to quote here one or two of the essential passages of his discourse.[6]

> "The health of a school of history depends upon mutual appreciation by all its elements of the various ways in which the sense of values finds expression. For the quality which distinguished the historical from other forms of the study of civilization is surely the fact that the historian is seeking for closer and ever closer approximation to an an understanding of the past activities of mankind. The man who is going out from Oxford into public life has had in the history school a particular kind of discipline of which the realization of the search for historical truth is the essential basis. He recognizes in historical erudition a development as natural as his own, of the work which he has done, and of the interests which he proposes to turn to public use. On the other hand, the man who is driven by some inner compulsion to more advanced work, if he is to study with profit, must not regard himself as in a class apart; he should not feel that he is entering upon an adventure in a world hitherto entirely closed to him and leaving behind the citizenship which inspires his fellows. It should be impossible for a sixth year man to feel that he is not as much at home within the school as he was in his third year...
>
> "If one spirit prevails in all the elements of a school of history, there need be no limits to the interest in history... Hence, while hope to see a systematic organization of advanced study, within the scope of the existing statutes and regulations, I venture to suggest that we should avoid the tendency to regard advanced students as constituting a separate post-graduate school, and should strive for the strengthening of one school in which there is room for all kinds of interest, and a mutual respect for all kinds of good work. In such a school the post-graduate workers, whether we have trained them from the first or they have come to us from elsewhere, would regard themselves and be regarded as an integral element, and by contributing to its health, would be

6. See F.M. Powicke, ***Modern Historians and the Study of History*** (London, 1955), p. 164.

conscious of their unity with each other."

These sentiments exactly express my own feelings, if I may say so, and the spirit in which I am moved to approach the subject of historical methodology and research in this University of the Panjab. It is a spirit which I hope to cultivate and encourage in the Department of History.

Lord Acton once told the leading English historian of our own day, Professor G.M. Trevelyan, that he considered that with all his faults Macaulay was the greatest of all the historians England has produced. Professor Trevelyan, however, notwithstanding that Macaulay was his great-uncle, is inclined to the view that perhaps Gibbon was greater in that he was more perfect, although his perfection was conditional on his limitations. Others, such as Sir Charles Webster and my old Teacher James Todd, claim that Lord Acton's Cambridge contemporary F.W. Maitland was certainly the greatest English historian since Gibbon. Although my own preference is for Gibbon and Macaulay in that order, I have always been attracted by Maitland's short definition of history. "What men have said and done, above all what they have thought—that is history."[7] Maitland's words have been endorsed by another British historian, Lord Bryce, who was also a politician and a diplomat.

> "History has for its subject human nature. It is the record of what man has thought, said and done. It is the lamp by whose light we see human nature in action, and we can understand the causes, the significance, the results of events in proportion to our comprehension of the characters of the men or the natoins concerned."[8]

For supreme narrative skill in the writing of English history I think we must go to Macaulay, the centenary of whose death has just occurred. He regarded history as the whole life of a people, as much more than a lifeless skeleton of the names and dates of battles and genealogies of royal houses.

> "He who would understand these rightly must not confiine his observations to palaces and solemn days. He must see ordinary men as they appear in their ordinary business and in their ordinary pleasures. He must mingle in the crowds

7. Cited by G.P. Gooch, *History and Hitorians in the Nineteenth Century* (1913), at p. 398.
8. Bryce, *University and Historical Addresses*, 30.

of the exchange and the coffee-house. He must obtain admittance of the convivial table and the domestic hearth. He must bear with vulgar expressions. He must not shrink from exploring even the retreats of misery."[9]

Macaulay first expressed these ideas in a brilliant essay which he wrote as a young man and which was first published in the *Edinburgh Review* in 1828. In this essay he also declared that the historian had abandoned to the novelist—he was thinking of Sir Walter Scott—the art of recounting how men lived in the different periods of the past, and that this ground ought to be claimed back by history. He was to do it himself twenty years later in the famous third chapter of his *History of England*, in which he described in superb prose the state of English society in 1685 and which must always be a model of English historiography.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century in England, a reaction set in against the so-called literary school of historians represented by Macaulay and Carlyle, and in favour of more strictly scientific methods. This movement had its origins in Germany, where Leopold Von Ranke and his pupils were impelled to apply the new habits and techniques through the greatly increased collections of source material which became available for study at this time. Encouraged to some extent by Lord Acton, who had spent his early years in Munich, the process reached its climax in England with the appointment of J. B. Bury as Acton's successor in the Regius Chair of History at Cambridge. On the occasion of his Inaugural Lecture, which he gave in 1903, Professor Bury sternly reminded his listeners that "history is not a branch of literature" and declared categorically that "history is a science, no less and no more." Meanwhile at the sister university of Oxford, the Regius Professor, York Powell, was saying much the same thing."[10]

The continued insistence that history is a science with its own rigid standards of critical analysis rather than an art, the art of what the Germans call the *historische Belletristik*, has undoubtedly led to the exercise of more caution in ascertaining the truth of historical happenings and the testing of historical evidence. But it has also produced a lot of unreadable history books, of which I regret to say that the annual output has by no means dried up. The scientific

9. Cited by A.L. Rowse, *The Use of History* (1946), at p. 53.
10. Rowse *op. cit.*, 86.

reaction went too far. Happily it has been corrected. Even Professor Bury, the leading apostle of the scientific method in England, lived to modify his view in his old age. Twenty-one years after his famous Inaugural Lecture at Cambridge, he wrote, "No history can be instructive if the personality of the writer is entirely suppressed; it will be dead and colourless and inhuman, however faultless it may be in detail, however carefully the rules of historical method may be applied."[11]

The rediscovery by the English reading public that history need not be dull began after the First World War with the writings of Lytton Strachey on Queen Victoria and some of her eminent contemporaries, and Philip Guedalla on Napoleon III, Lord Palmerston and the Duke of Wellington. The process was continued and consolidated by professional historians such as G.M. Trevelyan and J. E. Neale and in the non-academic field by writers like Sir Arthur Bryant, Sir Harold Nicolson and the late Lord Tweedsmuir, better known as John Buchan, who was good enough to propose me and secure my election as a Fellow of the Royal Historical Society in London in 1934. All of these men, besides being experts in historical research, knew how to write and were consequently able to produce works which were and still are enjoyed by a wide public.

In Britain, at least, the increased interest in history shown by the general public is reflected by the immense improvement in teaching the subject which has taken place in English secondary and public schools. Up to the First World War what was taught was largely determined by unimaginative examining boards. Sir Charles Webster has recently recalled that when he was at school, in the early years of this century, he was compelled to study the Tudor period of English history three times over and the journeys of St. Paul twice; and he had no knowledge whatever of what happened between those two periods except what he could glean from historical novels and such odd books as he could lay hand on.[12] Today courses of study are planned with some imagination, while a vast range of new techniques and apparatus has come into play, such as special libraries, maps,

11. Cited by the Hon. Steven Runciman in his lecture, "On the Writing of History", published by the Historical Association in *Jubilee Addresses* (London, 1956), at p. 64.

12. Historical Association, *Jubilee Addresses* ("Fifty years of change in Historical Teaching and Research"), at p. 35.

time-charts, building models and other visual and aural aids like broadcasting, television, films and film-strips. It is interesting to note that when Mr. S. L. Bernstein, one of the leading cinema theatre proprietors in Britain and owner of the Granada TV circuit, conducted an investigation a few years ago into the motion picture tastes of some 50,000 English school childern, his survey revealed that the childern's first preference was for historical films—before comedy, cartoons and even thrillers.[13]

English School history text books have also been greatly improved, and this improvement has involved the correction of frequent and widespread historical mistakes. Take Magna Carta, for example, the Great Charter extracted by the English barons from a reactionary and unwilling sovereign, King John, at Runnymede in 1215. The royal assent to this celebrated document, which gave concrete expression to the spirit of individual liberty in England, by protecting the king's subjects against illegal and arbitrary imprisonment, is an event which is very properly drilled into every English School boy and girl. In my time, the text books following J. R. Green's *Short History of the English People*, on which many thousands of English school children were brought up in late Victorian an Edwardian times, contained the statement that "the Great Charter was discussed, agreed to and signed in a single day." This single sentence contains three striking errors. Recent researches have proved that five days were occupied in the discussion and preparation of the Charter, and that it was not signed at all but sealed. Indeed we have no reason for believing that King John could write even his own name, as he lived in an age when writing was confined to priests of the Church and learned clerks. Anyhow there are no signatures at all on Magna Carta, of which two original copies exist in England.[14]

Time allows me to mention only one or two other common errors, which have some bearing on the history of the sub-continent.

Like other boys at school forty year ago, I was taught that the advances of the Osmanli Turks cut or choked the old trade routes between Europe and the East and so necessitated the finding of alternative routes; hence the voyages of the great discoverers like Columbus and Vasco da Gama, and the decline of the Republic of

13. See *The Teaching of History* published by the Incorporated Association of Assistant Masters in Secondary Schools (Cambridge, 1958), at p. 129.

14. See Ernest Scott, *History and Historical Problems* (London, 1925), at p. 187.

Venice which had controlled the European distribution of the old trade.

The fact is that the Turks did not capture Egypt and Palestine, where the principal trade routes converged, until early in the sixteenth century, that is thirty or more year *after* the great discoveries had taken place. During the greater part of the previous century the Portuguese had sent expeditions down the west coast of Africa in an attempt to find a sea route to Abyssinia and India, voyages which culminated at the end of the century in Vosco da Gama sailing round the Cape of Good Hope. When the Turks did eventually cut across the old trade routes in 1517, they would gladly have seized the benefit of the inter-continental commerce had it been forthcoming; but it had already passed to the Portuguese, who by this time had established their naval supremacy in the Indian Ocean. And so, for the next 350 years—until the Suez Canal was completed in 1869—the route round the Cape which the Portuguese had pioneered was to carry the great bulk of the trade between Europe and India.

Another hardy perennial error, which still occasionally crops up in English schools and even on the B.B.C., is the story that before Christopher Columbus could get his naval project sanctioned by Queen Isabella of Spain, he had to overcome the belief common among educated people of his time that the earth was flat. The individual responsible for the propagation of this myth is the American writer Washington Irving, whose biography of Columbus contains wholly fictitious account of the explorer's argument with the committee of learned men appointed by the Queen to report on this proposals. The principal point at issue turned not on the shape of the earth, whose spherical shape was not in dispute at all, but rather on the breadth of the ocean to be traversed before Columbus could reach Asia by the Western passage. Columbus asserted that it was much narrower than some of his examiners thought, and in the event neither side was able to convince the other. In fact, Queen Isabella equipped Columbus's transatlantic expedition beacause she believed in him, and as for the committee of experts such a body in the fifteenth century would be nor more likely to believe that the earth was flat than a similar body of educated men would today.

There are still some errors to be corrected in the accounts of that period in British-Indian history known as the Indian Mutiny. In some English school text books the idea continues prevalent that

there was some general conspiracy and pre-arranged plots and plans. There is no real evidence of this. The Nana Sahib and the Rani of Jhansi, for example, can no longer be regarded in the role of conspirators acting in concert with the mutineers. At the time of the uprising and for long afterwards many British commentators believed in the theory of a Muslim conspiracy, which had been designed as a religious crusade against the believers of a different faith. The first to demonstrate the falsity of this thesis was Sir Syed Ahmed Khan; but in spite of what he wrote in his book *The Causes of the Indian Revolt*, first published in Urdu in 1858 and in English in 1873, the tendency in Pakistan today seems to be to wish to write up the Mutiny as a Muslim national rebellion or organised war of independence.

In the undergraduate and post-graduate field of instruction substantial improvement have taken place both in teaching and study methods. Fifty years ago, for instance, practically no attention was paid to 19th century history in any British university. Other subjects were similarly neglected, such as naval history, the scientific study of war, the history of natural science, and American, Russian and Far Eastern political and economic history. The gaps have gradually been filled, although there is undoubtedly still room for improvement in the history departments of some of our universities. At the beginning of the present century, Profesor A. F. Pollard of London University lamented that modern histoty was the Cinderella of that institution; today London boasts the largest history school in Britain, while at Oxford the Modern History School is the largest of all the schools there. As late as 1904 Professor Pollard could also declare that no real centre of research existed in any English University. It was largely due to his inititative that in 1921 the Institute of Historical Research came into existence, an organisation which, as Sir Charles Webster has recently pointed out, today commands the admiration of scholars the world over and serves as a research centre not only for students in Britain but also for large number from overseas. A conspicuous feature of the Institute is the use of the seminar as a vehicle of instruction, an innovation imported from the continent of Europe, where it has long been in use, particularly in German universities. By means of the seminar, to quote Professor Webster again, "students are able to teach one another as much as they learn from their professors, and the professors can and should

learn as much as they teach."[15]

The increase in the number and variety of records which have become available during the present century is immense. To mention a single example, all government departmental records in the United Kingdom are now open without restriction to students to the year 1910, while some of a later date can be seen with special permission. Foreign governments have also opened their national archives to the student, included to a limited degree those behind the Iron Curtain. In Britain, too considerable numbers of private collections have been deposited by their owners in public libraries or otherwise made available. To this we must add the mounting habit of politicians and soldiers to record during their lifetime the events in which they have played a leading part, in autobiographical or edited works, which contain hitherto unpublished official and semi-official documents.

This vast increase in source material has been matched to some extent by a relative increase in the numbers of historians and history students who are making use of these original documents. In this they are aided by various scientific devices, particularly the photostat and the microfilm, to which is soon likely to be added the tape recorder. The photostat, from which virtually unlimited numbers of positive prints can be made from a single negative, is capable of saving the research worker many weary hours of transcription with pencil and notebook, besides being preferable in point of accuracy. The microfilm, on the other hand, enables documents in the mass to be accurately recorded, stored, read and, if necessary, reproduced in an enlarged from, so that complete collections may be duplicated in this way. How far this process has gone may be seen in one American institution, the University of St. Louis, Missouri, which durirg the past few years has, with the encouragement of the Holy See in Rome, succeeded in copying the whole of the Vatican Archives. The use of aerial photography has also proved of great value, especially in the fields of ancient history and archaeology.

The increase in the numbers of research students has naturally led to increased specialisation, which can be observed not only from the research projects in progress at any given moment, but from the production of secondary works on an extended scale. It would be idle to deny that this has tended to breed pedantic publications, overburdened with an excess of detail. On the other hand, this

15. Historical Association, *op cit.*, 37.

tendency has led the trained historian to limit the scope of his work in the interests of sound historical scholarship, which he must do if he is to master all the evidence avilable and demonstrate the scientific basis of his narrative.

So much for recent changes in method. What of interpretation ? There is, I think, one outstanding development in this technique which the present century has witnessed and which has had world-wide repercussions in historical thought, changing the lives of millions of the inhabitants of this planet. I refer, of course to Karl Marx and his so-called economic or materialist conception of history—the theory, briefly put, that the key to modern history is provided by the class struggle between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat in every country. For instance, the Marxist view of the Indian Mutiny is that, however the movement began as a military revolt, it quickly developed along class lines, with the inspired Communist role being played by the Wahabis, thus becoming "a peasent war against indigenous landlordism and foreign imperialism."

Whether you regard Marx as philosopher, economist or historian, there is no doubt whatever of the magnitude of the impact of his theory of history in the world today. He lived in the last century and did most of his work in the Reading Room of the British Museum in London. Yet you can search the pages of Dr G. P. Gooch's *History and Historians in the Nineteenth Century* in vain for any mention of Karl Marx. This is not the fault of Dr Gooch. It is simply due to the fact that at the date his work first appeard in 1913, Marx had not begun to make a real noise in the world. It was only after the First World War that his interpretation of world history was underlined, when it became the guiding beacon of Lenin and the other leaders of the Russian Revolution. Today in the Soviet Union and her satellite states, as well as in Communist China, the Marxist or Marxist-Leninist theory of history is either voluntarily accepted by, or else compulsorily imposed upon, all native historians, teachers and students. It has colorured the political thinking of the mass of the people of these countries, and its continuing success constitutes a formidable challenge to the historians of the world. That challenge, I venture to think, can best be met by subjecting the Marxist theory to a fresh analysis in the light of all the new historical evidence which is constantly becoming available. It should not be difficult, for instance, to refute the Soviet allegation that the Second World War began as a purely "imperialist" war between two rival

capitalist states, to be suddenly converted overnight into just and righteous war in defence of democracy when Hitler's Panzer divisions invadad the sacrosanct soil of the Russian Motherland

To take another illustration of Marxist-Leninist inspired history. Very recently, on January 4, 1960, the Moscow Radio broadcast a talk designed to show that Jesus Christ never existed and that the festival of Christmas is a capitalist plot to keep the working people in chains. The broadcaster went on to say :

> "The image of the supposed founder of Christianity is merely legendary and mythical. This is proved primarily by the fact that historians and writers who lived at the time when Jesus Christ allegedly lived and propunded make no mention of him whatsoever. ...
>
> "The Soviet people do not need the Gospel fairy tale about non-existing Jesus Christ. Soviet people do not wait for grace from God. They build their lives themselves, and in this they are guided not by a fairy tale about God but by the Marxist-Leninist doctrine of society's development. They create their happiness themselves."

My only comment is that, leaving aside the synoptic Gospels of the *New Testament*, this Russian broadcaster seems never to have heard of the non-Christian authorities of the period, the Roman historian Tacitus and the Jewish writer Josephus, who have each testified to Christ's existence as a man and the fact that he was crucified under the governorship of Pontius Pilate in Judaea in the reign of the Roman Emperor Tiberius, although naturally neither of these authors could assess or forecast the subsequent spread of the Christian religion. Christ is also mentioned by another Roman historian, Suetonius, who like Tacitus lived in the first century A. D., and there are some references to Christ too of an unsympathetic character in other Jewish texts of the time. Admittedly all this does not amount to very much in the aggregate, but the evidence does certainly confirm such salient facts recorded in the New Testament as that Christ existed and was put to death as I have described. Indeed to deny the historical existence of Jesus Christ is as absurd as denying that the Holy Prophet of Islam ever lived.

We cannot ignore the contribution of another individual in the realm of history, although unlike Marx he was in no sense a historian. This is Sigmund Freud, whose achievements and those of his school in depicting the role of the sub-conscious as a determining factor in

human conduct, has undoubtedly influenced the treatment of historical evidence in the light of the processes of psycho-analysis. As a result new explanations, sometimes far-fetched in the extreme, have come to be advanced for actions hitherto inexplicable or incomprehensible. This development has led some historical, or I should say pseudo-historical, writers who have picked up a smattering of Freudian love, to put forward psychological theories which cannot really be supported by the known facts.

However, in spite of the dangers and difficulties in interpreting human motives individually and in the mass by the clinical methods of Freud, I agree with Sir Charles Webster that historians everywhere have been much influenced by this conception, that it has become part of the climate of opinion in which they work, and that in being thus enabled to see deeper into the characters of many great men and women, the historians of today owe a great debt to Sigmund Freud. Freudian methods are also useful in studying problems of mass psychology, such as are presented by the influence of conscious and sub-conscious feelings of fear. In the Indian Mutiny, for example, these began with the fears of the Sepoys for their religion and personal honour, later developing into a widespread apprehension, to quote the Governor-General Lord Canning, that the British Raj "meditated a general bloody persecution of Mahomedans and Hindus," with the result that "large communities not otherwise hostile to the Government" became "deeply exasperated."[16] This is an aspect of the Mutiny which offers a most fruitful field of investigation.

I come finally to the Department where these techniques in historical method and interpretation should be applied. The institution of a seperate Department of History in the Panjab University is just thirty years old, although it was first proposed at least a decade earlier than this. It is worth while recalling that its creation was largely due to the initiative of the late Professor Ramsay Muir, a distinguished English historian and political scientist, at one time a Liberal M. P. in the British House of Commons and Vice-President of the Liberal Party in England. Professor Muri, who occupied the Chair of Modern History, first at Liverpool and then at Manchester, where he wrote his admirable work, *The Making of British India*, knew the sub-continent well and served as a member of the Calcutta

16. Cited by J. P. Harrison in the Historical Association Pamphlet, *The Indian Mutiny* (1958), at p. 9.

University Commission towards the end of the First World War. Following a visit to Lahore in 1913, the project began to take shape as part of the process of transforming the University from an almost exclusively examining and affiliating institution into a teaching body as well. The immediate result, in 1925, was the formation of a combined Honours School embracing Philosophy, Economics and English, as well as History. This experiment, courageous as it was, proved premature and was soon abandoned, chiefly on account of the difficulties in the way of effective inter-collegiate co-operation in teaching the four subjects together. In 1928, the late Dr A. P. Newton, Professor of Imperial History in London, came out to the Panjab as Visiting Professor; and as a result the separate History Department came into being in 1930, to be followed two years later by the inauguration of an Honours School of History, which also included Political Science. The successful establishment of this school and its subsequent growth were principally the work of the Department's first Head, Professor J. F. Bruce, a fine scholar, sympathetic teacher and tireless worker, who occupied the Chair until his retirement in 1944.[17] To Professor Bruce and his successors, specially the late Professor J. D. Ward and Professor Dilawar Husain, Principal of the Muhammedan Anglo-Oriental College in Lahore, who has stepped into the breach on more than one occasion when the Department has been temporarily without a Head, I think we must all be profoundly grateful.

The recently published findings of the Commission appointed by the Government of Pakistan to inquire into the existing educational system in this country have drawn attention to the serious set-back which the Panjab University and its affiliated colleges suffered as a result of the emigration of large numbers of qualified teachers in the period immediately following the grant of independence. Recovery is going on, but its tempo has necessarily been slow. The constant theme running through that part of the Commission's Report, which deals with higher education, is the need for the exertion of the most vigorous efforts to build up teaching and research facilities at the post-graduate level. In the future scheme of things as envisaged by the Commissioners, the question of which colleges should be associated with this university and in what form is of secondary importance. What is important—and here I quote the words of the Report—"what

17. See J. F. Bruce, *A History of the University of the Panjab* (Lahore, 1938), *passim.*

is important is that this the oldest of our universities should establish the highest possible standards of teaching and research."[18]

To this end I welcome the decision on the teaching side, not of course confined to the History Department, to intersperse the formal lectures, which are given to comparatively large classes, with the introduction of seminars and tutorials for smaller groups, thus making for real and valuable contact between teacher and student at all stages of the curriculum. But such an innovation has its limitations, imposed by considerations of staff, if the seminar or tutorial is to be kept to a manageable and effective size.

On the research side I likewise welcome the setting up of a Historical Research Centre, under Professor Sheikh Abdur Rashid, which has been entrusted with the specific task of preparing an objective history of the Pakistan people. This task is by no means an easy one, particularly when we remember that much of the necessary source material for such a history has remained in the libraries and archives of Bharat (India). But we are not altogether without allies, and I think we can look with confidence for aid from the newly formed Pakistan Historical Society, whose annual conferences as well as select publications show that the flame of historical scholarship still burns in this country in spite of political trials and vicissitudes.

From the point of view of supervision, the obvious place for a history student of this university, in which to undertake original research among manuscript records, is in the Record Office here in Lahore, where the official records of the old Provincial Government of the Panjab are preserved. However, I was surprised to learn that there is no full-time Keeper of the Records in this department; indeed there is only one full time officer of this kind in Pakistan, and that is the Director of Archives at Peshawar. I understand, too, that is the Lahore Record Office there are no proper catalogues or calendars of records after the year 1868, while public access to the records is only permitted down to the year 1884. I should like to voice a plea to the authorities, with all the strength at my command, for the appointment of a fully qualified whole-time archivist here, who is much needed and who should be provided with the necessary technical assistance to enable correct and up-to-date lists of the records to be prepared in

---

18. Government of Pakistan, Ministry of Education, *Report of the Commission on National Education* (Karachi, 1960), para, 147.

detail. I should also hope that the open date for inspection can be extended from 1884 at least to 1910, as is now the case in Britain, with the Keeper or Director being given discretion, after consultation with the authorities, to permit limited access for the subsequent period to 1947.

I have already referred to my connection with the north of Ireland. There my boyhood home was a few miles distant from Clandeboye, the family estate of one who, if he was not one of the greatest of Indian Viceroys, was certainly one of the most humane, Frederick first Marquess of Dufferin and Ava. Once, when I was going through his house, I remember noticing an illuminated scroll bearing witness to the fact that he had received the Honorary Degree of Doctor of Civil Law from the University of the Panjab very soon after its incorporation in 1882. How highly Lord Dufferin prized this distinction among the many distinctions he gained in the course of a long and distinguished public career, I do not know; but I would like to think that he set considerable value on it. What I do know is that, in the speech he delivered on the occasion in question to such an audience as yourselves, he stressed the need for co-operation between East and West in the sphere of higher education. I commend his words to you today, notwithstanding that they were first spoken three-quarters of a century ago.

> "In what manner your labours in the one hemisphere may most effectually supplement and commingle with the achievements of your fellow workers in the other; how you may best apply the products of your own past, so rich in everything that can warm the fancy and excite the imagination or exercise the speculative and metaphysical faculty, to the practical requirements of your future and the exigencies of our present hard and exacting age, is one of the principal problems with which you have to deal, and for which I have no doubt you will find a satisfactory solution."[19]

Here in the field of history a start at least has been made in the

---

19. Cited Graham, *op. cit.*, 278. On this occasion, in 1886, Lord Dufferin also stressed that the proper work of national education in India was "to bring East and West into some kind of harmony, preserving and promoting the indigenous languages and literature and encouraging the application of scientific methods to all branches of study." Sir A. Lyall, *Life of the Marquis of Dufferin and Ava* (1905), II, 144.

direction of realizing the prime objective which the Education Commission has indicated. But much remains to be done. I approach my own particular task in a spirit of humility tinged with more than a little apprehension, for I am conscious of the difficulties inevitably inherent in a Department which has been without a permanent Head for some years. Therefore, I am constrained to ask a good deal from you. I ask for your indulgence and forbearance, for your co-operation and for your support. For my part I promise you my whole-hearted loyalty, sympathy and energies, which with the help of Providence will be at your service for so long as I am able to serve you. Thus the way is open for us to go forward together and, actuated by a common spirit, endeavour to build here in Lahore a school of history, which one day will not only take pride of place in Pakistan but will succeed in establishing a reputation for real historical learning among teachers, research workers and scholars throughout the civilized world.

The History and Historiography of India*

PRATAPAGIRI RAMAMURTI

It is our object in the following article to discuss the validity of certain assumptions on which historians have attempted to construct narratives of India's past. With inadequate equipment, with no acquaintance with the theory of history, lacking the habits that fit them for their task they yet sit down most confidently to describe events exactly as they have happened. Their only anxiety is to fit out a real past; they have a haunting terror of shadows. That is why they are incapable of rising above the level of the mere chronicler.

The consequence has been that our histories are generally one-sided and present a misleading view of the past. It would appear that our historians have joined in a conspiracy to encourage a very narrow and unedifying conception of the purpose of history. By deliberately limiting the field to "what really happened" they have fallen victims to tradition in dealing with the past. They give us no insight into its true nature, into the content of its life as such. For, the story of India's past is wholly unlike that of any other country known to the world's history. It is essentially the history of the creative spirit struggling to express itself in a synthetic quest all through the ages. To comprehend it, it is not enough to watch the destinies of royal dynasties, the rise and fall of great empires.[1] We have to watch and note how this creative spirit permeates the institutional efforts of man in society and state; how it breaks into cadence of song and verse; how it perpetuates its own embodiment in stone and colour; and how finally it expresses itself in the inner existence of man in terms of

---

* *Journal* of the University of Bombay, Vol. II, part I, July 1933.

1. "If human history were merely a matter of wars and rumours of wars, kings and merchants, there would have been no artists and scholars, philosophers and scientists. The modern world would know nothing of music, nothing of pure science, and poets would have given immortality to warriors, but never have thought of skylarks, Greek Urns or some lost paradise. To omit from history these striving after that which is true and beautiful and good is forgetfulness; to reduce them to mere aspects of the economic struggle is brutality."
— Shailer Matthews : *The Spiritual Interpretation of History*, p. 29.

self-realisation. The perusal of mere events, of wars and crime,[2] leaves behind the impression that our history is a Mausoleum of dead issues. We cannot, indeed, help being filled with sorrow at the panorama of suffering and travail that the picture of our past unfolds. The most glorious empires that the genius of man could have erected, are now mouldering in ruins, choked up aqueducts, crumbling palaces and deserted cities. We see ourselves surrounded on all sides by heaps of ruins and our soul sinks into the deepest despondency with a griping, torturing dread of the inevitability of the biological law. We seem already to hear the rumbling of the approaching storm that would sweep our present also, in its turn, into the limbo of forgotten things.[3]

We thus get the impression that our past is a debris of ashes and bones. We fail to realise that it abounds with ideals and beliefs, with the achievements of the soul. We forget how little India has cared even to keep a record of her political events, for they were not the things that really mattered. She has revelled in things of the spirit and has always been a home of philosophers. The records of her kings are indeed neglected; but words spoken by an Yajnavalkaya or a Buddha or a Sankara are still remembered, zealously preserved in scriptures that would never die. The history of India is the record of the spirit, of the mind which expresses its thought in an endless quest : "Ever old, Ever new."

It is necessary, hence, to place India's history on its proper footing, and rescue it from genealogists, coroners, collectors of anecdotes, chroniclers of courts, of princes, and of nobles, who have trespassed on a province for above their own—"those babblers of vain things," to borrow the language of Buckle,[4] "who lie in wait in every corner, and infest this the public highway of our national literature." We can never grasp the dignity and value of the story of our past unless we could dive below the surface of these superficial presentation of facts to comprehend the spirit that filled and determined the content of life. The emphasis of the political sense, of the kingly *nexus*, has deprived most of our historians of the true perspective. We reel through a bewildering maze of lifeless irrelevant,

2. It is this perusal perhaps, that makes Gibbon say "History is little more than the register of the crimes, follies, and misfortunes of mankind."

3. Cf Spengler's Theory : *Decline of the West.*

4. *Civilization in England* Vol. II, p. 347 (World's Classics).

unedifying details presented with no selection or porportion. Freeman's famous epigram, "History is past politics," reinforced by great worthies like Ranke, Seeley and Sybel, still holds the field, and Carlyle's warning passes unheeded that, "far away from senate houses, battle-fields and kings antechambers, the mighty tide of thought and action was still rolling on its wondrous course."[5]

Our historians do not realise that what we wish to know is the man as such, for is not man more than a warrior or a subject or a prince ? They do not recognise that history's mission is to give us the content of his life, and that they should, therefore, appraise the world of facts in terms of value, reaching the subterranean spirit of the soul, the inward of which the outward humanity is but the expression.[6] What we wish to know is not the dead man, the fossil in itself, but the living thinking being he once was, his hopes and aspirations.

Our history, lest we court death, is not to be treated as a dead past, a past that has ceased to be. It has to be transfused into the living actuality it once was, by sweeping away the illusion of time, even as Carlyle insists. History, in its essence, is a resurrection; the flush of life in dead limbs. From the view of our realistic historians, the object of history is the past, an aggregate of things finished happening. But an event that has finished happening is just nothing, is non-existent.[7] To think of the past as simply the past is as hopeless as the metaphysician's search after things-in-themselves. The past as a thing-in-itself has no existence. It must be an ingredient of our present life, by not only being capable of being remembered but also experienced. Historical facts are not merely remembered facts but also experienced facts. We could live all history in our own person,[8] for is not history the continuous attempt at the advanture of living ?

We must, therefore, turn our back on realistic historians who are too much influenced by the temporal aspect of time to realise the unity of the Eternal, who consequently miss the perpetual presentness of the past. Every true history is contemporary history,

---

5. See Robinson's *The New History*, p. 7.
6. Cf. Taine's *History of English Literature*.
7. See R. G. Collingwood's Article, *Journal of Philosophical Studies*.
8. See Emerson's *Essay on History*. See Max Muller : *Selected Essays*, 1. II, p. 11.

because, as Benedetto Croce has rightly pointed out, it is the present producing of the spirit.[9] It is unfortunate that we should try to differentiate between different periods of time and thus miss all that is of human interest. There is a fundamental identity underlying human nature in all times and places. Otherwise, we could never account for the quick response of the modern man to the play and interplay of elemental human instincts, as they appear in some form or other in ancient literature. The fountain of our interest is that we pass again through all the periods of existence, ourselves alive in them. As much as the poet, we become what we sing. We live along the whole line of Ashokan pillars and Taj Mahals, the Ibadatkhanas and Panipats. The pageant is conjured up in its reality and we become, indeed, "spectators and sufferers in the event." How can we account for the perennial appeal of the Mahabharata, the Gita, the Upanishads, the Ramayana and the 'Shakuntala'? How can we explain the attraction of the Ajanta Frescoes, even after the lapse of centuries? How is it that even at this distance of time we are powerfully moved when we read the tales of Rajasthan? Do we not merge ourselves in the sad thoughts of the crowned philosopher, who, turning away in sorrow and disgust from the harrowing spectable of warring creeds and contending beliefs, sought refuge in the conviction that slowly dawned in his soul, that no single tune held the key to the infinite? Shall we be wrong, therefore, in building upon the human interest of the past?

History, thus, is not simply the past. Neither is it the event. The dominance of the 'narrative' spirit has vitiated the whole outlook of our historians. We generally get a bewildering catalogue of names and dates. All kinds of facts are given publicity in print, because we happen to stumble upon new documents or inscriptions. There is no question of selection or proportion; the anxiety is to present events as they really happened. Trifling details of dynasties and military history, lengthy personal anecdotes occupy much of the space, for, the historian thinks he has no right to express any verdict upon the facts or to grasp the theory underlying them. The construction of narrative chronologically arranged, is *not* history. It is something more. Facts are mere dross, as both Ruskin and Macaulay hold, and it is from the thoughts, the abstract truth that

9. *Theory and History of Historiography*, p. 11, ff.

the events and happenings embody, that history derives its value. History is the thought that expresses itself, the mind that records, and mind is prior to the fact. All history, that is to say, is in a sense in the mind of man.[10] It is the Law of man's being, the Idea in its potentiality, the Universal in its Spirit, even as Hegel would have it.[11]

The past, therefore, simply regarded as the past in the crude realistic sense, is wholly unthinkable. The past that we try to reach is not a world of things-in-themselves, a world that has ceased to be, and so an isolated fact. Such a fact can never be related to the present; the chain of linkeage is severed into its links. And yet, it is this linkage that is really significant; engrossed in the mere 'past,' we fail to grasp the continuous force which binds age to age, connecting the past and the future. Life is a lengthening chain and the social structure is continuous. We discover, how closely we are related to our fore-fathers, who sang the paeans of the Rig-Veda though so far removed from them in distance of time. Emerson has said that man is a quotation from the past; it would be truer to say that he is the epitome of all the ages. He inhales as his spiritual atmosphere the experience and knowledge of the past. "Man has been," writes Graham Wallas,[12] "increasingly dependent on social heritage." He is what he is, because of this; because, his father was what he was. Our fathers "are largely the stuff of which our present selves and our present world are made of."[13] It is only the savage that recognises not the rock from which he is hewn, the pit from which he is dug.[14] A realistic conception of India's history will prevent us from discerning its connective tissue; that its dense web 'is woven without a void,'

---

10. Our statement might be misunderstood, and we hasten to point out that this is not as a pre-composed symphony. Lotze has truly maintained (See Ward : *The Realm of Ends* : *Pluralism and Theism*, p. 310) that it is the irresistible demand of the spirit that history must be more than the translation into time of an eternally complete content.

11. See his *Philosophy of History*, Introduction.

12. *Our Social Heritage*, p. 19.

13. J. A. Smith in *The Unity of Western Civilization*, p. 72.

14. Sir Flinders Petrie : See his article on Discovering the Unknown Past in Harmsworth's *Universal History*, Vol. I. ("The power of regarding the past and of understanding the causes which has produced the present form of affairs is one of the greatest tests of civilisation.")

to borrow the phraseology of Lord Acton.[15] History interpreted as narrative of political events chronologically arranged, will miss the underlying unity and continuity of India's past. The political history of this country would appear neither smooth nor continuous. It seems jerky, made up of separate and apparently unconnected events, and thus discontinuous.[16] But the history of India is something more. The spiritual unity that the history of our past presents to us is, Das Gupta truly observes, "essentially one of spiritual aspirations and obedience to the Law of the spirit, which were regarded as superior to everything else."[17] The unity and continuity of Indian History lies not in its physical course, but in the plane of idea. The history of India is essentially the history of idea as distinguished from the history of fact. The continuity that smoothes its pages comes not from the facts in themselves, "for they are in the raw discrete, accidental, jumbled and discontinuous;" it comes from the vital relationship of our present to our past in the realm of spiritual striving; physical separateness does not affect the truth of this relationship. "Viewed from the standpoint of intervening space, the distance between the earth and the moon may loom large and tend to obscure the fact of their relationship."[18] And yet the earth and the moon are vitally intertwined in the plane of the spirit. The continuity of our history is thus neither physical nor biological.

To the eye of the philosopher, the history of India is, therefore, one vast continuous whole. We shall have to seek to embrace it in its spiritual unity. We shall only then assign each fact that is presented to us to its fitting rank in the scale of social progress. We cannot isolate and treat in isolation each fact from the series of temporal or spatial succession. Our knowledge of the past is a present awareness; present experience taken in as a unity, as a "synthetic unity," to borrow the expression of Croce,[19] which may reveal sequence in space and time; each unit of the sequence, however, not as a fact-in-itself, unrelated to others, but in organic relation manifesting the rhythm of

---

15. Lectures on Modern History; first Lecture : "Inaugural Lecture on the Study of History."
16. See C.W. Cole's Article : "Relativity of History," *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. XLVIII No. 2.
17. *History of Indian Philosophy*.
18. Rabindranath Tagore : "A Vision of India's History." Vide *The Visva-Bharati Quarterly*, April 1923.
19. B. Croce : *Theory and History of Historiography*, p. 12.

the flow of real life. The past of India is the living relic of the present. The India of the past is a projection of itself into the India of the present. That is why we have said that the true nature of India's history is its contemporaneousness. Whatever of the past goes into our present experience, is history in the largest sense of the word.

It is just here, that the historian diverges from the annalist. The historian is concerned with values and not with facts-in-themselves; he tries to interpret movements and tendencies. Facts can be recorded by ordinary observers. Those of us who have studied original manuscripts and inscriptions know very well that most of the writers of this category of historical evidence are not celebrated for their literary accomplishments and other mental endowments. They try to describe as faithfully as they can what they believe to be authentic events. They could even piece together, by a series of dates more or less precise, the events that they describe. It would not be difficult indeed, to date the accession of a monarch, or the change of a dynasty, and in such instances, it might be possible even to be accurate. The historian, however, is neither an antiquarian, nor a genealogist. His mission is loftier; and we shall comprehend it by realising that real history is the history of truths and tendencies, perceived by the mind, and not of events which are merely physical. How can we date movements of the mind in the world of human affairs ! It is the assignment of value, not the assignment of date, that is, therefore, of supreme importance.[20] The question of chronology leads us into the realistic meshes of things-in-themselves, for, any experience of ours is at once temporal and eternal. Its ingredient 'parts' cannot be comprehended apart from their unity. Philosophers like Dr Radhakrishnan and historians like V. A. Smith may hold that "in the absence of accurate chronology, it is a misnomer to called anything a history," and that a "body of history strictly so called must be built upon a skeleton of chronology, that is to say, on a series of dates more or less precise." Evidently, there is a serious confusion here between the office of the annalist and the function of the historian. History is not putting bits of information, chronologically arranged together, like beads on a string.

Everything depends on our understanding history, not as a past,

20. H. G. Wells complains that historians, "go in fear of rather small errors than of disconnectedness; they dread the redicule of a wrong date more than the disputabl e attribution of a wrong value."

but as a present interest. The so-called historical facts are not in themselves absolute. They are valid as related to your view of them. Those, who essay to construct narratives of events, exactly as they have happend, seek for objectivity where it is an illusion. For the facts themselves do not exist apart from our idea of them. They have no value if they cannot be referred to the meaning that they embody. This reference, which yields for us their significance, is essentially subjective; it is our estimate based upon selection and interpretation. And in this task of selection and interpretation, the historian has to make use of hypothesis as much as other investigators. He has to start with a theory, for historical facts have to be "related to a frame of reference." "Without reference to some theory," says Cole,[21] "the fact is an isolated entity of dubious validity and little meaning. The historian has to see, even as Darwin did, that all observation must be for or against some view if it should be of any use. Bacon's advice that we should renounce, for a while, our conceptions and try to acquaint ourselves with the things themselves would land us again into the world of things-in-themselves. The attitude of detachment is psychologically impossible and untenable. Open-minded we shall be; but open-mindedness, "does not mean mental vacuity."[22] We shall indeed be impartial; but the impartiality of the historian is not that of the mirror which merely reflects.[23] Historical truth does not exclude earnestness of conviction, for it is to serve as our common tribunal.

But to serve as a common tribunal, we might be reminded, history must be above contention. Its facts must be authentic, well-established. Everything depends however on what exactly we mean by the authenticity of history. If history is a present interest, mere annals in themselves are not history. They must be inspired by conviction. Historical facts are real, not in the empirical sense as our realists would have it, as events that had really happened. Truth in history is that which is accepted by the intellect and approved by conscience; for historical truth is concerned with human values. Those facts of history are true that satisfy our sense of right and justice; that can be related to our present experience in a significant way. Others must stand condemned at its bar.

21. Article : "The Relativity of History," *Political Science Quarterly.*
22. See Allen Johnson : *The Historian and Historical Evidence*, chapter on the "Use of Hypothesis."
23. See Temperley's J. B. Bury : *Selected Essays*, pp. 70-1.

And when we talk of experience we might be told that history "is a hybrid form of experience, incapable of any considerable degree of "being or trueness"[24] "for, the "being or trueness" of history is held to be its verified and verifiable certainty. And where this is not possible, a sceptical attitude is assumed and effort is dissipated in trying to sift what is supposed to be authentic, unquestionable fact from myth and legend. It is not realised in the first place, that even if we accept the veracity of all those records that have come down to the present, they after all constitute a very insignificant part of life. And where there are records it is very readilly assumed that there is no history either; as if historical truths depend upon their memory being preserved in the form of chronologically connected narratives.[25] "The essence of history," as Ratzel has well put it,[26] "consists in the very fact of happening, not in the recollecting and recording what has happened. "And further the kingly *nexus* of our historians vitiates their out-look by the make believe, that history is a record of political events. We ere, for instance, solemnly told by one of our historians,[27] that there is no history of Hindustan in the fifteenth century, which is, according to him, a formless epoch. And yet, he admits that elements out of which modern society arose, were taking their origin in that century. E. B. Havell has done well in pointing out that it will give us a very imperfect impression of Indian life if it were assumed that, "the somewhat sordid record of Muhammadan dynasties contained all that is most important to remember in the history of the period and absorbed the greater part of the intellectual activities of the people."[28] Our historians, however, are very scholarly and pedantic. They must needs turn courtiers and valets, and lose themselves in unedifying efforts to establish the authenticity of genealogical tables and birth-dates. What they want are facts, facts which can never be challenged. We must witness their wranglings, to be convinced of the futility of their attempts. One of them would tell us that Kautilya may be dated anywhere, between 400 B.C., and 400 A.D. ! Another would triumphantly bring forth a series of genealogical tables that he has most fortunately stumbled upon, to establish the fact, that Shivaji is verily a secion of the 'Suryavansa,' and that

24. Bosanquet : *Principle of Individuality and value*, pp. 78-9.
25. See Shailer Matthews : *The Spiritual Interpretation of History*, pp. 38-9.
26. *History of Mankind*, p. 5.
27. Rushbrook Williams: *An Empire Builder of the Sixteenth Century*.
28. *History of Aryan Rule in India*, p. 407.

he could be traced back to the Sun himself! While yet another historian, turned coroner, is not satisfied by the simple statement that a certain Rajah died on the battle-field. It is a well-known fact, and nobody has as yet questioned its veracity. Our coroner-historian will not be satisfied, however, before he has marshalled evidence running into some pages, from about a dozen sources to prove the death of the Rajah! Unfortunately for these chroniclers, genealogists, and coroners, they are not the only 'historians' in the field. There are many others, like themselves, who take up the refrain in heated controversies. The audacity of their mutual fault-findings is astounding. While one would suggest that the other has consulted writings, the language in which they are written he is absolutely ignorant of, another would claim that he alone possesses certain manuscripts which throw a wholly new light on history altogether. Every one claims that what he is establishing are historical facts!

But what is a historical fact? "The answer," says Cole,[29] "is that it is, at its best, what the historian thinks of what someone else thinks he saw or said or did or heard. At its worst, it is a paltry third or fourth-hand judgment." Some thinkers have even called historians liars. The "being or trueness" of history, as we have already pointed out is made to depend upon its verifiability. The unerring certainty of conclusions that we arrive at in the physical sciences, is not possible, it is held, in history, because of the inherent difficulties of experimentation. History is, therefore, regarded as a hybrid form of experience.

But the question of the veracity of historical evidence is, after all, irrelevant from our conception of history. The word, 'History,' originally meant 'enquiry' and only secondarily came to be applied to the embodiment of the results of inquiry in the particular form of narrative. The Greek word for 'History' is 'Historia' meaning search after truth. The "being or trueness" of historical facts, their objective reality as such, will land us again into the realistic meshes of the world of things-in-themselves. For, we ask along with Benedetto Croce: "How could that which is present producing of our spirit ever be uncertain?" It is only by effecting a divorce between life and thought in history that we are tempted to doubt the certainty and utility of history. History emerges from the very bosom of life constituting the unity of our experience.

---

29. "The Relativity of History," Article in *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. XLVIII, No. 2.

Each historical fact, isolated in its objectivity, however, simple and clear to our realists, is simply non-existent for us [30] It has no meaning, and can have no meaning. Facts as happenings are atomistic, if they are not related in the vital synthesis of our experience. And because we hold that history is essentially this unity of experience, we turn away from the mere welter of isolated facts to a construction from within in terms of personal values of an ordered universe of reason and truth Facts, by themselves, are, that is to say, particular. History, on the other hand, is universal, for our experience, in its nature, is universal. On the assumption that history teaches only the particular, Schopenhaur had denied to history the character of a science.[31] But how could that which springs from the bosom of life, which is verily its very content, be particular ! How could that which is a present interest merged in our existence as an ingredient of experience be treated in its objective isolation !

The History of India, as we conceive it, is not a mere welter of discordant facts, a record of kings and wars. It is essentially the embodiment of striving after that which is true and beautiful and good. It is the concretisation, through the actions of men, of the Eternal Quest to know and realise Reality. We cannot omit from our history the strivings of our philosophers, poets and prophets; a material rendering would make it coarse and brutal. Our history is essentially spiritual, pregnant with tendencies and movements that have deeply affected our humanity. Tendencies and movements, in their very nature, can never be treated as objective realities, because they are not physical facts, sensed by our external faculties. They can only be comprehended by the mind; and as such, could be reduced to a system of concepts capable of not merely philosophical, but even scientific treatment in the highest sense.

Our conventional historians might retort that in all that we have been so far seeking to establish, we are only taking refuge in a barren subjectivity, which is futile this side of metaphysics. Our view or experience of history might be merely an imaginary construc-

---

30 C. W. Cole says, "With all the will to objectivity in the world, all the hon sty that can be conceived, with all the desire to tell things exactly as thry have happened, the historian cannot produce work which has at the same time, significance and a close relationship to something that objectively existed in the past." (Article on "The Relativity of History.")

31. "The Sciences," he says, "in that they are system of concepts, speak entirely of universals. History speaks of particulars which betoken a contradictin,"

tion, which must appeal itself to the "facts of history." These facts, they might say, form the permanent background of reference, while our view of them might perpetually fluctuate. If history is concerned with values, how then, could that which is mere change yield any principle of interpretation ? On the one hand, the world-process itself, objectively considered, is a series of changes occuring in mere succession; a mere flow of facts. It is only an intellectualised construction that presents them to us either as united or continuous. To use Bergsonian language, it is a cinematographic view of history. If each fact were to be treated as such, apart from the flow, then its disconnectedness becomes manifest. How could that which is in itself isolated be referred to a theory which alone can appraise it in terms of value. On the other hand, apart from the objective world, our mental processes also vary, and verdicts based thereon would therefore constantly fluctuate. Our own view might change from time to time; the view of our generation likewise might differ from other generations. "Every generation," Trietschke has said, "has the right to portray the past as it appears to his own eyes." It would be impossible to recover values and truths from history. There seems to be great force in Macaulay's[32] regret that history is "sometimes fiction and sometimes theory."

That historical verdicts fluctuate, we readily admit. It is the incessant demand of the human spirit that they shall fluctuate. Otherwise, we would merely duplicate narratives, already extant. "History", said Goethe, "must from time to time be rewritten, not because new facts have been discovered, but because new aspects come into view, because the participant in the progress of an age is led to standpoints from which the past can be regarded and judged in a novel manner."[33] Our moral and social standards change with the passage of time.[34] Every generation, as Mark Pattison points out, requires the facts to be recast in its own mould, and demands that history be rewritten from its own point of view. This is an unconscious factor affecting all historians, both ancient and modern. Polybius himself has commented on it. It has been said that the younger generation feels pleasure in tearing down the idols of the

32. Read his essay on History.
33. See Teggart : *Theory of History*, p. 7, ff.
34. See Prof. R. W. Seton-Watson's Article "XX A plea for the Study of Contemporary History," in *History*, Vol. XIV, No. 53.

old.[35] So theories come and go. Prejudiced, therefore, with our present prepossessions, how, it may be asked, can we have any idea of the past as it was in itself ?

This is a very specious argument. History, as we have said, is not mere spatial or temporal succession, implying change in space and time. The comprehension of succession is its awareness as a unity in experience. There can never be mere change and succession as such. They are only relative; they are change and succession in reference to a comprehensive principle. Change is never fortuitous; there is no chance,[36] properly so-called in history. History is not even a record of pulsations as Huntingdon[37] has called it. Ideas of history based upon these premise are atomistic; they try to present the multiple facts of change and movement without co-ordination. Bare pluralism lacks reason; we do admit the force in the arguments of our opponents, if they mean that the historian has to start with a multiple hypothesis, for life being complex, no single interpretation would do. But if they assert that no interpretation is possible and that changing facts can only permit of objective presentation we have only to remark that this is a serious misunderstanding. To recognise the difficulty of a thing is not to admit its impossibility. Our main difficulty, indeed, is not the discovery and presentation of facts but the discovery of a comprehensive principle that would relate these facts in terms of historic law. And yet this is the true function of the historian. Our conventional historians are concerned only with the accumulation of personal details, trivial recitals of the deeds of kings and of wars, and of the intrigues of courts. Our object, on the other hand, to quote the noble words of Voltaire, is "to write a history, not of wars, but of society; and to ascertain how men lived in the interior of their families, and what were the arts which they commonly cultivated"; in short, our object is "the history of the human mind, and not a mere detail of petty facts ..." We wish to study the general march of civilization, to interpret the origin of laws and customs. In a higher sense "Civilization is the fact *par excellence*"[38] which demands our study—"a general definitive

---

35. See Pritchard : *Essays of Today*, pp. 14-15.
Ben Lindsey : *The Revolt of Modern Youth.*
C.E.M. Joad : *The Present and Future of Religion.*

36. See R. L. Schuyler's Article on "Law and Accident in History," in *Political Science Quarterly*, Vol. XLV, No. 2.

37. *Pulse of Progress*, p. 318.

38. Guieot : *History of Civilization*, Vol. I, P. 5.

fact, in which all the others terminate, into which they all resolve themselves." We cannot exclude it from history without mutilating it. We may well ask with Mallet, who in 1755 published his history of Denmark, "Why should history be only a recital of battles, seiges, intrigues, and negotiations? And why should it contain merely a heap of petty facts and dates, rather than a great picture of the opinions, customs, and even inclinations of a people?" By concentrating on the great march of human affairs, as Montesquieu has done in his "Spirit of Laws," it may be possible to rise superior to the accidents of history, as that great thinker characterises the events which ordinary historians relate. It would then be possible to discern the relation of events of each other, the connection that unites them. This is so because the method is essentially philosophical. It was through this method, that Turgot, who may share with Voltaire, Montesquieu and Hegel, the credit of having created the philosophy of history, arrived at a principle of order amidst the apparent confusion of variety of events. He could thus seize upon the history of man as a whole. In our view of historiography, laws and manners, thoughts and aspirations constitute the very soul of history. Indeed, they are history *par excellence*. Wars, anecdotes of kings, acts of Government are material and visible facts, and it is very easy to compile narratives of them. But their demand on our attention is not, in our opinion, more imperative than of the philosophical facts that can only be comprehended by the mind. Montesquieu relates the reign of six emperors in two lines. We shall likewise interest ourselves with more comprehensive things.

Objective reality, moreover, is an illusion; it must exist for somebody to be noticed. When we accept this, we at once introduce the subjective element. Every historian, however self-effacing he would try to be, cannnot help putting something of himself in his own work. Our conventional historians would indeed protest and say that history must be very impartial. But this is a metaphysical absurdity. As Prof. A. F. Pollard maintains, "imagination" must stand in the fore-front of the qualities, that make the ideal historian. "Eliminate personality," says Prof. Seton-Watson, "and you eliminate human nature, and what is history then but a wretched hust?"[39] Moreover, the historian is first and last a moral being. If he tries to press his personality out of his handiwork, it becomes mechanical and

39. Article on "A Plea for Contemporary History" in *History*, Vol. XIV, No. 53.

alien. Freedom demands that the historian shall recognise himself in his creation; the interest of history shall be, in the first instance, his interest. In any other sense, he is an annalist or chronicler; his initiative of thought and action in servitude to imperative objective facts.

History, moreover, is not a mere record of fluctuations. Tennyson never doubted that, "through the ages one increasing purpose runs;" and this purpose is the measure of the progress attained by mankind. The multiple phenomena of history, of movement and change, do illustrate the working of law. Law is not mere interpretation of change, but is the manifestation of development. Thus Muller Lyer accepts "Progress" as a fact of social development. As Bodin expressed long ago, "there has been through the ages of oscillations a gradual ascent."[40] No doubt there is always change, for "history largely depends upon the will of men, which is always changing, every day new laws, new customs, new institutions." But in all these shifting scenes, we do discover a tendency which compels the recognition of spiritual forces, if not a Spirit, in social development."[41]

Our conventional historians, unfortunately, divert our attention to the accumulation of dead facts, in their despair of finding any principle of unity. They insist that all we need is facts, and more facts. Mere massing of detached facts, they never realise, is not history. History can never be an aggregation of events or happenings. It is only when we become conscious of the supreme significance of history as the realisation of the Spirit, of the manifestation of God in the human world, that we can rescue this branch of study from its present degradation. History reveals the presence of God. Through history, we obtain as Flint says, "a veritable increase of our knowledge of God's character and ways." We discern the design of Providence, the fulfilment of God. The story of mankind, and more especially of India, is the record of the eternal quest to comprehend life in its spiritual unity.

We, therefore, urge with all the emphasis we are capable of, that we shall have to set aside received notions and begin with a novel approach in the task of reconstructing India's past. It is time we realised the fallacy of our old conceptions of historiography. So long as our histories continue to be written from the standpoint of the

40. Quoted by Bury: *The Idea of Progress*, p. 39.
41. Shailer Matthews: *Spiritual Interpretation of History*, p. 6.

mere "past," of the mere "event," our narratives would lack the tone of reality because divorced from life. Our plea is that history must, hereafter, be written from the standpoint of "life." For history is the human epic, and nothing less. It is a titanic struggle for the realisation of freedom.

The history of India, "with all the changing scenes, which its annals present, is this process of development and the realisation of the spirit; this is the true *Theodicaea*, the justification of God in History. "[42] What has happened, and is happening every day, is not only not "without God," but essentially "His Work."

The historian of India shall therefore not lose himself in the happening as such, but shall realise the Spirit which is the life-impulse. History, in other words, shall seek to justify the ways of God to men.

---

42. The language is Hegel's *Philosophy of History*.

Some Documents regarding Sacred Sikh Relics in England

SARDAR NAHAR SINGH

[These documents regarding the sacred relics of Guru Gobind Singh taken to England after the annexation of the Panjab were collected by Sardar Nahar Singh, M.A., of Nangal Khurd, District Ludhiana, from the National Archives of India, New Delhi, and from the *Press Lists* of the Punjab Government Record Office, Lahore. Sardar Nahar Singh is an indefatiguable research scholar in the history of the Sikhs with special reference to the Namdharis on whom he has written a number of books and papers. His collection of documents on ***Gooroo Ram Singh and the Kuka Sikhs (The Kuka massacre of 17th and 18th January, 1872)***, pub. in 1967, and ***Documents relating to Bhai Maharaj Singh***, pub. in August 1968, deserve special mention.

The documents published below have been culled from Sardar Nahar Singh's two booklets (1) ***Documents relating to the Sacred Swords of Gooroo Gobind Singh in England***, published in December 1964, and ***Documents relating to Guru Gobind Singh's Swords and Sacred Books of the Sikhs in England***, published in 1967. For this we offer our grateful thanks to him. —Editor]

1. Secretary of State's Despatch No. 16 of 16 April, 1851

Political Department

Our Governor General of India in Council

1. We now reply to your letter in the Foreign department dated 25 March, No. 8 of 1850 and to the Governor General's letter dated 19th Dec., No. 597, 1850.

2. The Governor General states that with reference to our despatches in the Military department No. 6 of 1849 dated Ist May and No. 8 of 1849 dated 4th July, he has selected from the arms and armour in the Lahore Toshekhana four complete sets for transmission to England. He had selected for Her Majesty two best and most complete sets, adding portion of other sets which were remarkable

for beauty or by some traditional history. Thus with other portion of the arms belonging to the great Maharaja, His Lordship has selected for Her Majesty the sword presented to Ranjeet Singh, by Holkar when that Chief met the "Maharaja at Umritsar on his retreat before Lord Lake's army."

3. On the arrival of these articles in England we shall take the necessary measures for delivering them to Her Majesty.

4. ... ...

5. There are several other articles on which our orders are requested, *viz.*, ...

3rd. A set of arms including spear, etc., which Sikh traditions assert to have belonged to the Gooroo Gobind, "and of which it would in the Governor General's opinion be impolitic to allow any Sikh institution to obtain possession. The Governor General requested that if we are not desirous to place these arms in our museum, he may be permitted to purchase them from the Toshekhana, but we have much pleasure in requesting the Marquis of Dalhousie to retain these articles with the exception of the sword, as a memorial of the great events in which His Lordship bore so important a part. The sword as having belonged to the founder of the Sikh nation we are desirous of placing in our Museum as an historical relic."

We are your affectionate friends,
Signature of 13 gentlemen members of the Council of the Secretary of State.

London,
16th April, 1851.

2. Orders :

Requested the Board of Administration to send the Golden chair and the arms of the Gooroo to this Toshekhana previous to my quitting Simla for Calcutta. Proper precautions should be taken for their safety.

A document certifying these arms and recording the facts or tradition established regarding the sword be forwarded at the same time in triplicate, signed by Misr Megh Raj or whosoever may be the authority for the tradition.

(Initials of Dalhousie)
3/6

3. From the Secretary to the Government of India with the Governor General to the Board of Administration for the Affairs of the Punjab Foreign Deptt.

Sirs,

Adverting to my letter of 18th Dec. last No. 2903, I am desired by the Governor General to request that you will send the Golden Chair and the arms of the Gooroo Gobind Singh to the Government Toshekhana here previous to His Lordship quitting Simla for Calcutta.

2. His Lordship further directs, that proper precautions be taken for their safety on the road.

3. A document certifying the arms and recording the facts or traditions established regarding them should be forwarded at the same time in triplicate signed by Misr Meghraj or whosoever may be the authority for the tradition.

I have etc.,

Simla, 11th June, 1851. Sd. H. M. Elliot

4. Translation of an Urzee from Rue Misr Meghraj Treasurer

12th September, 1851.

States in reply to a Parwanah addressed to him calling for information regarding the arms of Gooroo Govind Singh, that the under-mentioned parties presented the following arms to Maharajah Ranjeet Singh and others saying that Gooroo Govind Singh used to wear them. The Maharaja sent them into the Toshekhana, and directed that they should be worshipped every day.

(1) **Shamsher Wa Sipar** *(Sword and Shield).* These were presented on 30th Bysakh, 1880 sumbut (1823 A.D.) by one Dya Singh of Peshawar to Maharajah Ranjeet Singh, who gave him a well and a suit of clothes (on return).

(2) **Dae-I-Ahinee** *(an iron weapon).* A hillman brought this to the Maharajah 28 years ago.

(3) **Neza** *(a lance)* was presented to Maharajah Runjeet Singh by the Singhs of Ubchalnagar.

(4) **Chukkur-I-Ahinee,** a circular missile *weapon* of iron. An Akalee Singh presented this to M. R. Runjeet Singh at Utuk.

(5) **Shamsher Teghah** *(a scimitar).* Taken from one Baba Bhartee on 25 Mugghur, 1878 (or 1821 A.D.), and made over to the Toshekhana by Maharajah.

(6) **Kulghee-I-Kuch** *(a crest of glass in a silver case).* A Sahibzada descendant of (Nanak) of Vyrowal brought this to M.R. Runjeet Singh on 7th Chet, 1881 (1824 A.D.).

(7) **Burchee** *(a small spear).* This belonged to Kumlagarh

Raja (Chief of Mundee) who used to worship it. General Ventura got it, when he took the fort of Kumlagarh and presented it to Koer Naunihal Singh in the month of Magh 1896 or 12 years ago.

(8) **Burcha** *(a large spear)*. The Khalsa army got this at Jummoo when they invaded that place 8 years ago. The whole army used to worship it.

True Copy

(Sd.) P. Melvill, *Secretary*.

5. *From Major G.H. MacGregor, C.B. Deputy Commissioner in charge of citadel establishments to P. Melvill, Secretary, Board of Administration, Lahore*

Lahore [Citadel],
23rd September, 1851.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 780, under date 24th June last, I have the honour to inform you, that agreeably to the instructions conveyed in Government letter No. 1846 of the 11th instant, I have this day dispatched towards Umballa under a suitable escort to the care of Deputy Commissioner Umballa the Golden Chair and the arms and etc., of Gooroo Govind.

1.	Jamadar	52nd Regt. N.I.
2.	Havaldars	
	Naiks	
	Sepoys	

(2) The document called for in the 3rd para of Sir Henry Elliot's letter, is herewith forwarded in triplicate (duly signed by Misr Megraj).

I have etc.,
Signed, G. H. MacGregor

6. *From P. Melvill, Secretary to the Board of Administration to Sir H. M. Elliot, K. C. B., Secretary to the Government of India, with the Governor General*

Lahore,
30th September, 1851.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 1846 of the 11th June last, I am directed by the Bd. to forward for the information of the Most Noble the Governor General the annexed copy of a letter from the Deputy Commissioner of Lahore reporting the dispatch to Umballa on the 23rd instt. of the Golden Chair and the arms of Gooroo Govind.

(2) Misr Megraj's account of the arms is enclosed in triplicate as desired, together with an English translation.

I have the honour to be, etc.,
P. Melvill

7. *From the Governor General and Members of the Council to the Hon'ble the Court of Directors*

Fort William, Foreign Deptt.,
5 Feb., 1853.

Hon'ble Sirs,

With reference to para 157 of our letter No. 46 dated the 7th August last, we have the honour to apprize your Honourable Court of the dispatch by the General Screw Steam Shipping Company's vessel *Bosphorus* of the Golden Chair of Maharaja Runjeet Singh and the Sword of the Gooroo, for your museum.

2. There were two swords said to belong to the Gooroo. The Governor General has selected for your Hon'ble Court the one which is not only the better in appearance, but which from the written representation of Misr Meg Raj accompanying the arms, appeared to have been most prized by Maharaja Runjeet Singh.

(Sd.) Governor General and Members of the Council.

II

The Raekote Sword of Guru Gobind Singh

8. *From G. C. Barnes, Commissioner and Superintendent, Cis-Sutlej Division to P. Melvill, Secretary to the Chief Commissioner for the Punjab*

General

Kussowli, 24th May, 1854.

Sir,

I have the honour to submit for the consideration and orders of the Chief Commissioner copy of a letter No. 103 dated 10th May from the Deputy Commissioner of Loodianah, together with a narrative in original prepared by Rao Imam Buksh and Ahmed Buksh relatives of the late Ranee of Raekote presenting a sword which once belonged to Gooroo Govind, one of the apostles of the Sikh faith, for the acceptance of the Most Noble the Governor General.

2. Gooroo Gobind was the second in rank among the founders of the Sikh religion. He was hard pressed by the Mogul forces and found refuge at Raekote. In token of his gratitude he left with his host a sword which ever since has been cherished as an heirloom by

the family. Sikh Chieftains, such as the rulers of Lahore and the Maharajah of Puttealah at various times have been desirous to possess this relic, but the late Ranee would never consent to surrender it.

3. She has lately died, and her estate for want of a lineal heir becomes an escheat to the British Government. Rao Imam Buksh and Ahmed Buksh are her nearest relative though some generations removed.

4. Both are applicants at the time upon the liberality of the Government, and probably in submitting the particulars of this escheat. I shall have to recommend them for a small pension.

5. In tendering this gift, they are not therefore entirely disinterested and although it is an invidious task to depreciate an offer, so spontaneously made, yet I should be wanting in my duty, if I failed to represent all the circumstances of the case.

6. The sword is an ordinary looking blade with a gilded hilt, and a scabbard newly covered with red velvet. It bears the inscription in Goormukhee character as given in Mr Brereton's letter. I doubt myself whether any historical value attaches to this weapon. In the zenith of Sikh power this relic might have been coveted by eminent Sikh leaders, but I do not think, the same anxiety for its possession would be manifested now.

I have etc.,
Sd/- G. Barnes

9. From Henry Brereton, Deputy Commissioner, Loodhiana, to G. C. Barnes, Commissioner and Superintendent Cis-Sutlej States, Cussowilee
General

Loodhiana, 1st May, 1854.

Sir,

In continuation of my letter No. 102 dated 7th last, I have the honour to inform you, that Rae Imam Buksh (sometimes called Mamoo Khan), upon receiving from me the personal property of the late Ranee of Raekote, produced a sword, which has been a treasured Heirloom in the family for some generations. He expressed a wish, that the sword should be forwarded to the Governor-General. It may be interesting to have its history, which is as follows:—

(2) When Gooroo Govind escaped from his enemies at Makhowal he sought refuge and received protection from the Raekote Chief, in gratitude for this kindness he presented him his sword, which was all he possessed with the injunction that it should not be worn or

carried except in battle or in some great emergency.

(3) The sword was treasured with religious care, until the time of the late Rao[3] who took it with him on occasion of a sporting excursion contrary to the earnest remonstrances of his followers. His horse happening to fall with him he drew the sword to cut the stirrup leather by which he was entangled. The struggles of the horse however were violent and the Rao received from the drawn weapon a wound on his thigh, the haemorrhage from which quickly caused his death.

(4) This sword has been greatly sought by various Sikh chiefs from Ranjeet Singh to the present Maharajah of Putteealah, who have at different times offered very large sums for its possession. All temptations have been, however, indignantly repelled by the late Ranee and the presentation of this treasured memento of the Great Sikh Gooroo by Rao Imam Bux is I think a graceful act on his part and deserves acknowledgement. It would be gratifying to him if the sword were forwarded to England, deposited in honour with the other historical relics of the Sikh Empire.

(5) I have translated the following inscription from Goormookhi which is engraved on the sides of the blade:—

> "May God's protection rest on me. There is one God, and a true Gooroo, whom I worship. This is the signature of the 10th Khalsa Ootar (*i.e.*, Gooroo Govind). This sword is the protection of all kinds of harms, the Omni-present God is with me always, God the protector of the lives of men."

(6) I have deposited the sword in the Treasury, pending your directions.

I have,
(Sd.) H. Brereton

10. ***From P. Melvill, Secretary to the Chief Commissioner for the Punjab to G.S. Edmonstone, Secretary to the Government of India, Fort William***

Political

Lahore, 6th June, 1854.

Sir,

I am directed to forward to you for the orders of the Most Noble the Governor General in Council, the accompanying copy of a letter No. 116, dated 24/26 May, from the Commissioner Cis-Sutlej States, with the enclosure from the Deputy Commissioner of Loodiana

reporting that a sword which once belonged to Gooroo Gobind, one of the apostles of the Sikh faith, has been presented for acceptance of His Lordship by Raes Imam Buksh and Ahmed Buksh—the nearest relatives of the late Ranee of Raekote, whose Estate has lapsed to Government.

I have the honour to be,
Sir.
Yours most obedient servant,
(Sd.) *Secretary to the Chief Commissioner.*

11. *(Note in G.G.'s Office.)*

The lapse of this state of Raekote, one of the nine in the Cis-Sutlej left independent in 1845/46, was lately reported The Ranee who was allowed to succeed to her deceased husband, the last ruler, is dead, and there is no lineal descendant of the Raekote Chief.

Rao Imam Buksh is the nearest living relative of the deceased Ranee. Hence Sword, which is said to have belonged to Gooroo Govind, and of which the history is given by the Deputy Commissioner of Loodianah, for the acceptance, says the Chief Commissioner, of H. Ldp., but from the Deputy Commissioner's letter it would seem to be the wish of the Rao that the sword should be deposited in honour with the other historical relics of the Sikh Nation

The sword is said to have been coveted by the M.R. of Lahore and by H.H. of Putiala who offered large sums for it, but the Comm. C.S.S. nevertheless doubts whether any historical value attaches to the weapon.

The offer of a much prized heirloom (which the owners at any rate consider to possess historical value) seems a graceful act. This the Commissioner says not altogether a disinterested one perhaps, *seeing* that Rae Imam Buksh and another are applicants for pensions from Government.

'Raekote' is a single walled village, the annexation of which to the Loodianah District will be beneficial in consolidating its jurisdiction or rather...further kept unisolated...in which the Deputy Commissioner had no authority; but it will not add more than Rs. 3500 or Rs. 4000 to Government Revenue and, against this will have to be debited any allowance that may be granted to the late Ranee's two relatives.

15-6-54. (Sd.) G. (illegible)

Lord Dalhousie's Note (In his own handwriting)

It does not clearly appear, what destination is intended by the donor for the sword. The Ch. Comm., says that it has been presented for the acceptance of "His Lordship."

The Comr. says, "it is presented for the acceptance of the Most Noble the Governor General."

The Dep. Com. says, "expressed a wish that it should be forwarded to the Governor General."

Elsewhere in the same letter he says, "It would be gratifying to him if the Sword could be forwarded to England and deposited in London with the other historical relics of the Sikh Empire."

The Court already possesses a Sword of the Gooroo, with his name on the blade.

The Ch. Commissioner may be asked what is the man's actual wish. If he wants to forward it to the Court, it can go : if he wants to present it to me, I can't accept it, but it may go *as usual* to Toshekhana, or I will pay for it.

It is our wish, it should not be rejected.

(Initials) *Dalhousie*

16/6. Signature of other members also.

12. *To J. Lawrence, Chief Commissioner, Punjab*

Foreign Deptt., Fort William,
23rd June, 1854.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Secy.'s letter of the 6th inst. No. 486 with its enclosures, regarding the presentation of Raes Imam Buksh and Ahmed Buksh, relatives of the late Ranee of Raekote, of a sword, which once belonged to Gooroo Govind, the apostle of the Sikh faith.

2. In reply I am directed to state that it does not clearly appear what destination is intended by the donor for the sword in question. In your Secy.'s letter it is stated, that the sword has been presented for the acceptance of his Lordship. "While the Comm. C.S.S. says that it is presented for the acceptance of Most Noble, the Governor General."

The Deputy Commissioner of Ludhiana writes that he (Imam Buksh) expressed a wish, that the sword should be forwarded to the Governor General, but elsewhere the Depy. Comm. says and adds, "it would be gratifying to him (Imam Buksh) if the sword were for-

warded to England and deposited in honour with other historical relics of the Sikh Empire."

3. From the above quotations and the correspondence with H. L. in-C., it appears uncertain what are the actual wishes of Imam Buksh, with regard to the sword in question. I am directed to request, that you will be good enough to ascertain and report further on that point.

(Sd.) GE

22/6. Secy. GG.

If the donor requests, that the weapon should be forwarded to the Court of Directors, it will be sent to them. If he wishes, that it should be presented to the G.G. His Lordship, I am desired to state, cannot accept it, but the sword as usual be sent to the Govt. Toshekhana and H.L. will take it by paying for it. At any rate the G.G. in C. is of opinion, that the sword should not be rejected.

13. *From the Deputy Commissioner Loodiana to the Commissioner and Supdt. Cis-Sutlej States Distt. Ludhiana*

15th July, 1854.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No. 1293, with enclosure, I have the honour to inform you that the wish of Rae Imam Buksh and Rae Ahmed Khan, the relatives of the late Ranee of the Kote, as expressed to me at Raekote, was to this effect, that the sword of Gooroo Govind should be sent to the Most Noble the Governor General with a request that should he be graciously pleased, he would cause it to be deposited with the other relics of the Sikh apostle, which were believed by the Raos, and by the people generally, to have been conveyed to England, from Lahore with Koh-i-noor and other state jewels formerly belonging to the Sikh Government.

2. The feeling which led to the presentation of this sword was not that of offering a personal *Nazzer* to the Most Noble the Governor General. It was that of a strong respect for relic itself, to which a religious sanctity is attached. They evidently desire to see it preserved permanently by the British Government to which the Sikh Empire and Regal rights of their own family have lapsed.

3. It has been a legend well-known among the people of these parts and the Sikhs generally that as long as this sword remained with the Raekote family, and the injunctions of the Gooroo regarding its use were observed, no evil could befall him.

4. The death of the late Rao by an accidental wound from this

weapon, the absence of the lineal descendants and heirs to his name, and the consequent absorption by the supreme Government of the Sovereign rights and possessions of the family, are all attributable to the violation of the Gooroo's instructions by the deceased Rao.

5. The impression still remains, with regard to the peculiar virtues of this relic — the Maharajahs of Lahore and Puttiala have evidently attached considerable importance to its possession, and on such ground although these matters are always liable to exaggeration, it is perhaps advisable, as a *political* measure that the sword should be known to have been sent to England.

6. The motives of the Raos of Raekot in presenting this sword were, I believe, those of loyalty to the British Government, being the supreme power and legal heir of lapsed sovereignty.

I have...

(Sd.) Brereton

14. *From G. C. Barnes, Commissioner and Supdt., Cis-Sutlej Division to R. Temple, Offg. Secy. to Chief Commissioner for the Punjab*

(Political)

Kussoolee,
12th August, 1854.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your letter No. 570 of 5th July, with enclosures from the Secretary to the Government of India, regarding the destination of a sword presented by Rao Imam Buksh and Ahmed Buksh of Raekote.

2. I thought that this sword, which once belonged to Gooroo Govind, was intended as a present for the acceptance of the Most Noble the Governor General...There were no Sikh relics that I knew of desposited in any office or museum in England.

3. However, on receipt of the Government orders, I applied to Mr. Brereton, the Deputy Commissioner of Loodiana for a solution of the doubt expressed by the Government. A copy of his reply No. 171 dated 15th July is annexed. Mr. Brereton states, that the wish of the donors to be "that the sword of Gooroo Govind should be sent to the Most Noble the Governor General, with a request that should he be graciously pleased, he would cause it to be deposited with the other relics of the Sikh apostle in England."

4. I took the precaution of writing myself to the Raos to ask their instructions. A copy of their reply is also submitted. After

stating the inestimable value they attach to this sword, the Raos desire that it may be forwarded through the Most Noble the Governor General of India to Her Majesty the Queen of England.

5. I solicit your attention to paragraphs 5 and 6 of my letter No. 116 dt. 24 May last. This sword has undoubtedly a local interest. It would be prized by any Sikh chieftain, for instance by the Maharaja of Patiala. But it is not unworthy of destination intended by the donors. The Sikh religion has not the claim of authority, nor the prestige of an extended sway It is a faith which has already begun to decline, and in its best days was confined to be a remote province of the peninsula. Gooroo Govind too was not the founder, but an eminent disciple of the new creed. Memorials of the Gooroo have no permanent interest even on this scene of his labours and in my opinion are valuable only to those who profess the Sikh religion.

I have etc.,

(Sd.) G.C. Barnes.

15. *(Office Note on the file)*

In June last, a letter was despatched to Hon'ble Chief Commissioner intimating that Rae Imam Buksh, the nearest relative of the deceased Ranee of Raekote (a small independent state in the Cis-Sutlej division), had offered for His Lordship's acceptance a sword which had belonged to Gooroo Govind, and which was much prized as a relic of historical interest. But as it was not quite clear what destination was intended for the sword in question, Ch. Commissioner stating that it was tendered to the Most Noble Governor General, while the Dupty Commissioner of Ludhiana stated, that it would be gratifying to the donors, if the sword were forwarded to England and deposited with honour with other historical relics of Sikh Nation."

The Chief Commissioner was requested to ascertain the donor's real wishes.

The Chief Commissioner now forwarded 2 letters one from the Commissioner Cis-Satlej States and the other from the Deputy Commissioner, Loodhiana; in the latter of which it is said that the wish of the Raekote Ranee's relatives is "that the sword of Gooroo Govind should be sent to the Most Noble the Governor General with a request, that should he be graciously pleased, he should cause it to be deposited with the other relics of the Sikh apostle, which were believed by the Raos and the people generally to have been conveyed to England from Lahore with the Koh-i-Noor and other state Jewels, formerly belonging to Sikh Government." The Deputy Commissioner

states that the feeling, which led to the presentation of the sword, was that of strong respect for the relic itself, to which a religious sanctity is attached and that the donors evidently desire to see the sword preserved.. etly by the British Government, to which the Sikh Empire and the Sovereignty of their own family have lapsed.

The Chief Commissioner, in opposition to Mr. Barnes, the Commissioner, who rather deprecates the value of the sword as a religious relic, considers it to be not unworthy of its high destination, as having belonged to the first political leader of the Sikh sect, and the founder of the famous Khalisah, the warrior Priest, whose memory is reverentially cherished by the remant of what was once one of the strongest and most vigorous sects that ever arose in India.

As His Lordship has determined, that the gift should not be rejected, the Chief Commissioner might be requested to have it despatched with orders to its transmission to the Hon'ble Court, and to convey to Rao Imam Buksh the acknowledgment of the Govt. of India for this interesting relic, informing him, at the same time, that it would be forwarded to the Hon'ble Court for presentation to Her Majesty. G.G. 2/10.

This is already *ordered* and may be done. But the Court has already a sword of Gooroo Govind from the Maharajah's Treasury.

(Initials) Dated 6-10.
Signed 10-10.
Signed 12-10.

16. *From R. C. Temple, Secretary to the Chief Commissioner of the Punjab, to G. F. Edmonston, Secretary to the Government of India*

(Political)

Lahore, 18th September, 1854.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No. 2680, of the 23rd of June, I am directed to forward for the information of the Most Noble the Governor General in Council, copies of letter No. 194 of the 12th ultimo, from the Commissioner of Cis-Sutlej States, with its enclosures, supplying the further information required, regarding the presentation of the Sword of Gooroo Govind by the Raekote family.

2. It appears that the donors desire that the sword should be presented to Her Majesty, the Queen of England. The Chief

Commissioner considers the gift to be not unworthy of its high destination. If Nanak was the first religious teacher, Govind was the first political teacher of the Sikh sect. He established a "Theocratic Polity," and founded the famous Khalsa. He gave his followers the name of *Singh* or Lion, and taught *them to resist their oppressors, by force of arms.* He imparted unity and energy to a secular system. His predecessors were preachers. He was emphatically the warrior Priest, and his memory is reverentially cherished by the remnant of what was once one of the strongest and most vigorous sects that ever arose in India, the Sword of such a man, the Chief Commissioner thinks, is doubtless a relic of much historical interest.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your Most obedient servant,
(Sd.) R. C. Temple

17. *To J. Lawrence Esq., Chief Commissioner of the Punjab*

Foreign Deptt., Fort William,
13th Oct., 1854.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Secretary's despatch No. 816 dated the 18th ultimo with its enclosures, supplying further information required regarding the presentation of the sword of Gooroo Govind by the Raekote family.

2. In reply, I am directed by the Governor General in Council to request that you will have the sword in question despatched to Calcutta, with a view to its transmission to the Honourable the Court of Directors, and that you will convey to the donors, Raes Imam Buksh and Ahmad Buksh, the acknowledgements of the Government of India for this interesting relic, informing them at the same time it will be forwarded to the Hon'ble Court for presentation to Her Majesty.

I have etc.,
Signed

14/10.

Note (A)

18. *Excerpt from an application of Rae Imam Bukhsh and Rae Ahmad Khan to the Deputy Commissioner of Ludhiana in the Persian Language.*

"Roze ke Janab Mai Sahiba muazamma mukaramma rahlat frama shudand wa Sahib Deputy Commissioner Bahadur zilah Ludhiana barai mazart wa tashafi ma beksan wa daryaft hal ronaq afroz kasba Raikot shudand, Ma fidwyan bakhyal khud fahmida shamsher-i-mutbarika Guru Gobind Singh ra keh bihtar azin bebaha nazar Shahan ba-khanae khud nah dasthtand khidmate Deputy Commissioner bahadur barai Nazar Shahanshah Inglisia bahadur bazaria janab mustajab Governor General Sahib Bahadur guzaranidem.

(Punjab Government Records.
23 September, 1854—November 7—a)

(1) Rai Shahbaz Khan.

(2) *"Parwardgar Tum ko salamat ba kramat Rakhe aur riyasat par mukim farmave. Aur Is Shamsher ko mutbarak samajh kar baja tor par apne pas rakhna."*

(Punjab Government Records, 22-9-1854.)
(Anarkali Tomb, Lahore, No. 7-10).

(3) Rai Ilyas Khan by name, who died in 1802 A.D.

(4) Maharaja Ranjit Singh wanted to get this sword. Mian Kadar Bakhsh, a trusted officer of the Raja of Kapurthala was sent for this purpose, but the Rani refused to part with the sword, for any amount of cash money or *Jagir*.

(5) Maharaja Narindar Singh Sahib Bahadur of Patiala, who ruled Patiala State from 1845 to 1862.

(6) Ranee Bhag Bharee, widow of *Rae* Ilyas Khan. She died in April 1854.

19. From R.C. Temple Esq., Secretary to the Chief Commissioner for the Punjab to G. F. Edmonstone, Secy., Government of India (Foreign), Calcutta.

Political

Lahore,
28th November, 1854.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 4461 of the 13th Ultimo, I am directed by the Chief Commissioner to report to you, for the information of the Most Noble the Governor General in Council, that the Sword of Gooroo Govind has this day been despatched to your address through the Lahore Post Office.

I have etc.,
(Sd.) R. C. Temple

20. Inscription on the blade of the Sword of Guru Gobind Singhji
(Raekote Sword)

A. In Gurmukhi Characters

[ਦਹਿਨੀ ਤਰਫ]
ਅਕਾਲ ਪੁਰਖ ਕੀ ਰਛਆ ਹਮਨੇ

ੴ ਸਤਿਗੁਰਪ੍ਰਸਾਦਿ ਓਤਾਰ ਖਾਸੇ ਪਾਤਸ਼ਾਹੀ ੧੦
ਸਰਬ ਲੋਹ ਕੀ ਰਛਆ ਹਮਨੇ

[ਬਾਈਂ ਤਰਫ]
ਸਰਬ ਕਾਲ ਕੀ ਰਛਆ ਹਮਨੇ ਸਰਬ ਜੀ ਕੀ ਰਛਆ ਹਮਨੇ

B. Transliteration of the above

[Right Side]
Akāl Purakh kī Rachchiā hām ne
Sarab Loh kī Rachchiā ham ne
Ek Onkār Satgur Parsād Autār Khās Pātshah 10

[Left Side]
Sarab Kal kī Rachchiā Ham ne
Sarab Jīa kī Rachchiā Ham ne

Loodiana,
Deputy Commissioner's Office,
10th May, 1854.

(Sd.) H. Berton,
Deputy Commissioner

Sd. R.C. Temple,
Secretary

C. Translation of the Inscription on the Sword

[On the right side of the blade]
"The eternal Being will save me, God is One and Suth Gooroo is the Great Incarnate.
This sword is His Gift and bears the Royal signature. All instruments of Iron will do me no harm."
[On the left side of the blade]
"I am safe (with this) at all times,
All creatures will protect me."

21. [Receipt for the Sword]

Calcutta,
19th December, 1854

Received in the Government Toshekhana a Box containing a Sword, which belonged to the late Gooroo and was received from the Commissioner of Punjab for despatch to the Hon'ble the Court of Directors.

(Sd.) Illegible
Supdt.

22. From the Governor General in Council, Calcutta, to the Court of Directors, London

Foreign Deptt., Fort William,
8th January, 1855.

Hon'ble Sirs,

With reference to Paras 212 to 215 of our letter No. 102 dated the 15th Dec. last, we have the honour to transmit a copy of a letter from the Secy. to the Chief Commissioner for the Punjab, intimating the dispatch of the Sword of Gooroo Govind, and forwarding a copy of the inscription on the blade.

2. The sword has been received, and will be sent to your Hon'ble Court by an early opportunity.

Ordered that a copy of the above despatch be forwarded to the Foreign Department whence the Chief Commissioner of the Punjab will be called upon to report on the proposal.

We have, etc.,
(Signature of the Governer General
and the members of the Council)

23. From the Court of Directors Political Department Despatch No. 24 of 1855.

Our Governor General of India in Council.

28. Items 212 to 215—and letter dated 8th Jany. No. 1855—a sword, which had belonged to Gooroo Govind has been presented to the Governor General by Rao Imam Buksh and Ahmed Buksh, relatives of the late Ranee of Raekote with the expression of a wish that it might be transmitted to England and presented to Her Majesty. It has been received at Calcutta, and will be forwarded by an early opportunity.

Orders

On receiving this relic, we shall take the proper steps for the delivery of it to Her Majesty.

Sword of Gooroo Govind Singh

London, Signatures of Directors
3rd October, 1855.

III

Guru Granth Sahib of Kartarpur

[Note: The following documents were preserved in the pre-partition days, 1947, in the Punjab Government Old Record Office, Anarkali Tomb, Lahore.]

24. *From Bhai Nihal Singh, Mohtmid of Guru Sadhu Singh (of Kartarpur) to Deputy Secretary to the Board of Administration, Punjab.*

Serial No. 796. 20th February, 1850.

Sub :—Application of Bhai Nihal Singh for a Granth taken away by Dr. Login

Abstract

Petition from Bhai Nihal Singh representing that Dr. Login has taken away his *Granth* or Sacred Book and begging that it may be restored to him.

25. *From Major H. P. Burn, Deputy Secretary to the Board of Administration, Punjab to Major MacGregor, C.B., Deputy Commissioner, in charge, Durbar Establishment, No. 57, 22nd February, 1850.*

Abstract

The petition is forwarded to Major MacGregor, in charge of the Darbar Establishment, with a request that the *Granth* may be given up to Sadhu Singh on his becoming responsible for its safety.

26. *From Major G. H. MacGregor, C.B., Deputy Commissioner, Lahore, in charge of Citadel Establishment to Major H. P. Burn, Deputy Secretary to the Board of Administration, Punjab*

No. 106. 11th April, 1850.

Subject :—Delivery of a copy of the Granth to Guru Sadhu Singh

Abstract

Major MacGregor, Deputy Commissioner, Lahore, in charge of the Citadel Establishment, reports the terms on which it is proposed to deliver over the *Granth* to Guru Sadhu Singh. Solicits the Board's orders on the subjects.

27. *From Major H. P. Burn, Deputy Secretary to the Board of Administration, Punjab to Major G. H. Mac Gregor, Deputy Commissioner, Lahore*

No 137. 22nd April, 1850.

Abstract

The Deputy Secretary to the Board of Administration authorizes Major MacGregor to make over the *Granth* to Guru Sadhu Singh on his binding himself unconditionally to be responsible for it. The security offered by Rajas Teja Singh and Dina Nath may be dispensed with as not being sufficiently adequate.

28. *From Major G. H. MacGregor, Deputy Commissioner, in charge of Citadel Establishment to Major H. P. Burn, Deputy Secretary to the Board of Administration, Punjab*

No. 207. 13th July, 1850.

Subject :—Restoration of the Adi Granth Sahib to the Original Owners

Abstract

Major MacGregor, Deputy Commissioner, in charge of the Citadel Establishment, reports, that the Gurus to whom the *Adi Granth Sahib* was given have applied for the restoration of the Golden *Charpoy* on which the *Granth Sahib* formerly rested and which is not in the Moti Mandir. Solicits the Board's instructions.

29. *Court of Directors' letter*

Public Department,
London,
12th August, 1857.

No. 111 of 1857.

Our Governor General of India in Council

1. It has been suggested to us through Professor Wilson, by Mr. N. Cust of the Bengal Civil Service, that it would be an object of great interest to obtain a perfectly correct copy of the Grunth or sacred Book of the Sikhs, and have a translation made of the Book into English or some other European language.

2. It is undoubtedly desirable that the Government of India becomes acquainted with the Book, which regulates the principles and opinions, both moral and religious, of so large a population, but the wishes and feelings of those professing the religion should be consulted before the gratification of this desire and the book, if permitted to be translated, be rendered into the English language.

3. We are desirous, therefore, that you should consider in what way the proposed objects may most effectively be carried out and report to us the opinion on the subject, which you may be led to form, after consultation with the officers who may be best qualified to give advice on the subject.

We are etc.,
(Signatures of the Court of Directors)

30. *From Major H.P. Burn, Deputy Secretary to the Board of Administration, Punjab, to Sir H. M. Elliot, Secy. to the Government of India with the Governor General*

Foreign — 1850, Political—Adi Granth

15 August, 1850.

Sir,

By order of C.I. Mansel & J. Lawrence, Esq.

I am desired by the Board of Administration to report for the information of Government that on the application of Gooroo Sadhoo Singh, they have delivered and restored to him the *Adi Granth,* he becoming responsible for its safe keeping.

2. This copy of the *Granth* is held in much veneration by the Sikh being the original book handed down to them from Gooroo Urgun Nath, their fifth Gooroo.

3. It used latterly to be kept in the Durbar, and rested on the Golden stand. This stand was not given up with the book to Gooroo Sadhoo, and he now applied for it. Its value is estimated at Rs. 850/-.

4. The Board recommends its restoration, and with the sanction of Government, will direct it to be given to the Gooroo.

5. Another copy of this sacred Book, the *Baba Grunth* which also came down from the time of Gooroo Urjun, has been entrusted to the care of Bhaees Ram Singh and Needhan Singh of Mangat who were its custodians, during the time of the Darbar.

6. Its golden stand is also looked upon, by the Bhaees, as belonging to the Book, and they pray for its restoration. Its value is the same as the stand of the *Adi Grunth.*

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your most obedient servant,
(Sd.) H.P. Burn

31. *From the Secretary to the Government of India with the Governor General to the Board of Administration for the affairs of the Punjab, Foreign Department*

Restoration of Adi Grunth

Simla, 28th August, 1850.

Sir,

I have the honour to acknowledge the receipt of your Deputy

Secretary's letter dated the 15th instant No. 337, reporting the restoration to Gooroo Sadhoo Singh of the *Adi Grunth* and to Bhaees Ram Singh and Nidhan Singh of the *Baba Grunth*, and recommending the restoration also of the Golden stand on which the book rested.

2. In reply, I am directed to inform you that the Most Noble the Governor General has been pleased to comply with the recommendation of your Board.

I have ...

(Sd.) H.M. Elliot

32. *Extract from the proceedings of the Right Hon'ble the Governor General of India in Council in the Home Department under dated the 10th Nov., 1857.*

No. 2354.

Read a despatch No. 111 of 1857 dated the 12th instant from the Hon'ble the Court of Directors forwarding for a proposal for the translation into English of the Grunth or sacred Book of the Sikhs.

33. *To the Chief Commissioner Punjab*

Foreign Department, Fort William,
13 November, 1857.

Sir,

I am directed by G.G.-in-Council to transmit to you the enclosed copy of a despatch from the Court of Directors in the Public Department No. 111 dated 12th August regarding a proposal for the translation into English, of the sacred book of the Sikhs, and to request, that you will report your opinion upon the proposal in question,

I have etc.,

(Sd.) (Secretary)

34. *From D.F. Mcleod, Financial Commissioner for the Punjab to R.H. Davis, Secy. to Government Punjab and its Dependencies*

Revenue General

No. 42. Lahore,
21st February, 1859.

Sir,

With a letter No. 4568 dated 13th November, 1857 from the Secretary to the Government of India, the Chief Commissioner of the Punjab received a copy of a despatch from the Hon'ble the Court of Directors, in the Public Department, No. 111, dated 12th August, 1857, approving of a suggestion made to them by Mr N. Cust that a correct copy of the Grunth or sacred book of the Sikhs should be

procured and a translation made of it into English or some other European language. This letter and enclosure were referred to me with a request, that after consulting with such of the most influential Sikhs, as I might think proper, I would indicate the course it might appear to me advisable to adopt.

2. I have the honour to return the above documents and to state, that I have now in my possession, an authentic copy of all the *Grunths* made over to me by Guru Sadhoo Singh Sodhee of Kurtarpur, Chief of the Sodhee priesthood, the representatives of Guru Govind. All the natives with whom I consulted, indicated him as the proper party to supply a copy, as he possessed the original written or signed by the Gurus themselves-and could at once have faithfully transcribed and on my applying to him he promised to have this done.

3. Accordingly in fulfilment of this promise he sent to me, some-time ago, conveyed in his own state bullock carriage or Rath, a copy of the *Adi Grunth*, or precepts of the first 5 Gurus compiled by Guru Arjun, and a short time ago, the remaining volume, designated the *Daswain Padshah ka Grunth* or book of the 10th leader Guru Govind was made over by him to the Deputy Commissioner of Jullundur, in whose district Kurtarpoor is situated from whence it has been recently forwarded to Lahore.

4. My request to the Guru was that he would have copies made by transcribers, whom Government would remunerate for the task, but although he, at the time, made no objection, he now altogether declines this, stating that he has presented them himself, out of respect and deference to the British Government. He has also since informed me, that so great a privilege has been always attached by him to the possession of the only true originals that although Maharajah Ranjeet Singh had expressed a desire, to obtain a copy taken from them, he had refused to give one. It will, I think, be suitable if he receives from the proper quarters, a recognition of this act of compliance.

5. I would now suggest, that these two volumes which I have had fitted into suitable box, be sent to England for deposit in the Oriental Library belonging to Her Majesty, and it would be in my opinion most appropriate, that Sir John Lawrence should himself present them on their reaching England. By their being thus disposed of, not only will a valuable addition be made to the manuscripts of the above library, but the very best opportunity will be afforded to the

oriental scholars of Europe, who may be so inclined to study the book and render it into English or other European tongue.

6. In India Gurumuhki language and character do not appear to have been taken up by any of our oriental scholars with interest, and I know of no one here who possesses the requisite knowledge, inclination and leisure, for the task of making a translation. I would strongly recommend, therefore, as the preferable course that the scholars of England and of continental countries, be invited to undertake the task on which they would bring to bear philosophical appliances and opportunities and an amount of oriental research and learning not to be looked for her.

7. If, however, it be desired, that the translation be undertaken in India, ordinary copies of the Grunth, and men to explain them are readily procurable, and it has been suggested that the easiest mode would be, to have it first translated into English. Mr. Cust is quite prepared to have this plan out into execution if the requisite funds be placed at his disposal and as he has peculiar tastes and aptitude for such an undertaking, was himself the original proposer of the scheme, and is now located at Umritsar, the Headquarters of Sikhism, it could not be trusted to better hands.

8. Another mode, in which the same object might perhaps be attained would be by an offer of a certain sum, say Rs. 1000/- for a good translation of the Grunth, when some of our officers or other individuals, who may have the taste and the leisure for oriental pursuits, would perhaps qualify themselves for the tasks, and compete for the honour and the reward thus held out.

I have, etc.,
(Sd.) C. Paske,
Personal Assistant
for Financial Commissioner of the Punjab

True Copy

Signed R. M. Davies,

No. 143. Secretary to Government of Punjab.

35. From R.H. Davies, Secretary to Government, Punjab and its dependencies to the Secretary to the Government of India, Foreign Department

Political Department

No. 1802.

Lahore,
Ist March, 1859.

Sir,

With reference to your letter No. 4568 dated 13th November, 1857, to the address of the late Chief Commissioner, forwarding for report and opinion copy of a despatch from the late Hon'ble Court of Directors, regarding a proposal to translate into English or some other European language, the "Grunth" or the sacred book of the Sikhs, I am now directed to forward copy of a letter from Mr D. F. Mcleod, Financial Commissioner on the subject.

2. It will be seen that Mr Mcleod has succeeded in obtaining a perfectly authentic copy of all the "Grunth" from Gooroo Sadhoo Singh *Sodee* of Kartarpoor in the Jullundur District, the Chief of the *Sodee Priesthood, who are the representatives of the Gooroo Govind.* Mr. Mcleod further suggests that these books be sent to England for deposit in Her Majesty's Oriental Library and that they be presented by John Lawrence now on his way home. By these means, an opportunity would be afforded to the Oriental scholars of England and the continent to reproduce the Grunth in an European garb.

3. The Honourable the Lieutenant Governor concurs in the foregoing recommendations. He fears with Mr Mcleod, that there are few, if any in the Punjab, who have the knowledge, inclination and leisure requisite to make a proper translation of these Grunths and that it would be far better done in England.

4. If, however, it be desirable that the translation be made here then no one better could be selected to superintend the work than Mr Cust, who was the original projector of the scheme, and is now resident at Amritsar, the headquarters of the Sikh religion.

5. Lastly, I am to commend to the favourable notice of His Excellency the Governor General in Council the readiness with which the Gooroo Sadhu Singh Sodee has met the wishes of Government in furnishing transcripts of the only authentic copies of the Grunth extant, a favour which he is described as having refused even to the Maharajah Ranjit Singh himself. The Honourable the Lieut. Governor trusts that the acknowledgement of Supreme Government will be accorded to the Gooroo.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Yours most obedient servant,
(Sd.) Secretary to Government, Punjab.

36. *From R. Simson, under Secretary to the Government of India to R.M. Davies, Secretary to the Government Punjab and its Dependencies.*

Foreign Department, Fort William,
8th April, 1859.

Sir,

In reply to your letter of the 8th ultimo, No. 177, I am directed by the Governor General in Council to state that it will be better that the translation of the Granth, or sacred book of the Sikhs, should be made in England. With this view a copy of the correspondence will be sent to the Home Government with references to the despatches of the Hon'ble the Court of Directors in the Public Department No. 111, of the 12th August, 1857.

2. His Lordship in Council requests, that the thanks of the Government be communicated to Gooroo Sadhoo Singh for the readiness with which he complied with the request made to him for transcripts of the Granth.

I have the honour to be,
(Sd.) R. Simson

37. *To the Right Hon'ble Lord Stanley, M.P., Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India*

Political Despatch to Secretary of State

No. 54. Foreign Department, Fort William,
22 April, 1859.

My Lord,

With reference to the despatch from the Court of Directors in the Public department, No. 111, dated 12th August, 1857, regarding a proposal for the translation into English of the Grunth, or sacred book of the Sikhs, we have the honour to transmit copy of a letter from the Secretary to the Punjab Government, dated the Ist March, last, together with a copy of our reply to it.

We have the honour to be etc.,
(Sd.) (1) Canning
(2) (3) (4)

Contents

No. 54, 22nd April, 1859.
No. 179, Ist March, 1859.
No. 1802, 8th April, 1859.

38. *From R.A. Davies, Secretary to the Government Punjab and its Dependencies to Cecil Beadon, Secretary to the Government of India*

Foreign Department, Calcutta

Pol. Department,
Lahore,
25th of June, 1859.

Sir,

In reply to your letter No. 1802 of the 8th April, I am directed to note for the information of the Right Honourable the Governor General in Council that Mr E. Prinsep, Deputy Commissioner of Sealkote, has been instructed to receive charge of the Grunth and to convey it to Sir John Lawrence, Baronet, G.C.B., for presentation to Her Majesty's Oriental Library, as a gift from Gooroo Sadhoo Singh Sodhee of Kurtarpore and in view to its being translated in England. As the Supreme Government are aware, Mr Prinsep is already in charge of some presents for Her Majesty from the Maharajah of Cashmere and the opportunity seemed a fitting one for sending home the Grunth.

I have the honour to be,
(Sd.) R. H. Devies

39. *To the Right Hon'ble Lord Stanley, M.P., Her Majesty's Secretary of State for India*

No. 111. 16th July, 1859.

My Lord,

In continuation of our despatch No. 54 dated 22nd April last, we have the honour to transmit copy of a letter from the Secretary to the Punjab Government, dated 25th June, intimating that Mr G. A. Prinsep, had been instructed to receive charge of the Grunth and to convey it to Sir John Lawrence for presentation to Her Majesty's Oriental Library as a gift from Gooroo Sadhoo Singh Sodhee of Kurtarpoor, and in view to its being translated in English contents.

We have etc.,
(Sd.) (1) Canning
(2) Outram
(3) H.B. Harrington

40. *Political despatch from Secy. of State, to Governor General-in-Council, Calcutta*

No. 34. Foreign 1860 24th April, 1860.

My Lord,

I have received the copy of Grunth, despatched to England under the charge of Mr F. Prinsep from the enclosures to your despatch No. 54 of 1859. I learn that this copy was prepared by direction of the Gooroo Sadhu Singh Sodhee and by him presented as a mark of respect to the British Government. It is my wish, that your Lordship should cause a complimentary letter to be written to the Gooroo thanking him in the name of Her Majesty's Government and that you should also present him with a suitable *Khillat*.

I have received also with your despatch No. 16 of 13th July the copy of the life of Guru Nanak written in the Gurumukhi language and illustrated with original drawings by native artists. This interesting volume is presented by Bedi Bikrama Singh, one of the chief representatives of the family of Guru Nanak. It is desirable that in this case also, you should make a suitable acknowledgement to the donor on the part of the British Government. The English narrative of the life of Nanak forwarded with this is very creditable to Mr Cust.

I have the honour to be,
your etc.,
C. Wood.

IV

Guru Granth Sahib and Dasam Granth in the British Museum London

[In addition to the above, the British Museum, London, also has the following rare and important manuscripts of the *Adi Sri Guru Granth Sahib* and the *Dasam Granth*. The following notes were taken by me on May 3, 1972, in the Museum reading room. Ganda Singh.]

(1) No. Or. 1125. *Adi Guru Granth Sahib*

It has 663 leaves written in ink, in addition to 31 leaves of index. Folios in English are written in pencil, the last being 696. On the reverse of leaf 2 (folio *1b*) begins *Japji* in golden ink. The manuscript ends with folio No. 696 (marked in pencil) with the last five leaves containing the following :

Leaf 660 (folio 692 *a*, line 8) ਮੁੰਦਾਵਣੀ ਮਹਲਾ 5 ॥

ੴ ਸਤਿਗੁਰ ਪ੍ਰਸਾਦਿ ॥ ਸਲੋਕ ਮਹਲਾ ੧ ॥
ਜਿਤ ਦਰਿ ਲਖ...

Leaf 660 *b* (folio 692 *b*)	੧ੳ ਸਤਿਗੁਰ ਪ੍ਰਸਾਦਿ ਸਲੋਕ ਮਹਲਾ ੧ ॥ ਬਾਇ ਆਤਸ...
Leaf 661 *b* (folio 693 *b*, line 3)	੧ੳ ਸਤਿਗੁਰ ਪ੍ਰਸਾਦਿ ॥ ਰਾਗੁ ਰਾਮਕਲੀ ਮਹਲਾ ੧ ॥ ਆਸਣੁ ਸਾਧ ਨਿਰਾਲਮ ..
Leaf 663 *a* (folio 695 *a*, line 4)	੧ੳ ਸਤਿਗਰ ਪ੍ਰਸਾਦਿ । ਹਕੀਕਤ ਰਾਹ ਮੁਕਾਮ...
line 18	੧ੳ ਸਤਿਗੁਰ ਪ੍ਰਸਾਦਿ । ਰਾਗ ਮਾਲਾ ੧ ਰਾਗ ਏਕ ਸੰਗ...

The *Rāg Mālā* ends with its 20th line. In the same line begins ਸਿਆਹੀ ਕੀ ਬਿਧਿ which ends with the next line (21).

On folio 696 a, ਸਿਆਹੀ ਕੀ ਬਿਧਿ is given again. Then on the same page, upside down, is the following inscription :

> After the Infantry charging the Enemy at Goojeratt, Cavalry and Light Artillery pursued the fugitive Sikhs and Afghans. The Infantry then advanced steadily in lines until clear of the blazing camp when they piled Arms. It was then I found this book in a Tent of one of the hostile chiefs--probably Shere Singh's.
>
> This is called The *Grunth* or Code of Sikh Religion. It is highly prized by the Sikhs and I have had many solicitations for it from Sikh gentlemen.
>
> Lahore, 1849 April. Henry Erskine
> 10 Foot

Below it on the left sideis

J.W. Daversaw
Military Prison
Cork 1851

Among the last leaves of the manuscript, on the second leaf, on the left, is the signature of *H. Erskine*, and a little below it, is written *Goojerat 21 February, 1849.*

(2) No. Or. 2159. *Adi Gurū Granth Sāhib*

According to the inscription on the first folio in the beginning of the index, the manuscript was completed on Magh Sudi 5th, Samvat

1802 Bikrami, Basant Day, January 16, 1746, thirtyseven and a quarter years after the death of Guru Gobind Singh.

At the end of the index are given the dates of the deaths of the ten Gurus.

The manuscript ends on 809th leaf with the following arrangement after ਮੁੰਦਾਵਣੀ ਮਹਲਾ ੫.

805 *b*	line 18	ਮੁੰਦਾਵਣੀ ਮ. ੫
	24	ਸਲੋਕ ਮ. ੧ ਜਿਤੁ ਦਰੁ ਲਖ ਮੁਹੰਮਦਾ
806 *a*	12	ਸਲੋਕ ਮ. ੧ ਬਾਇ ਆਤਸ
807 *a*	6	ਰਾਗ ਰਾਮਕਲੀ ਰਤਨਮਾਲਾ ਮ. ੧ ਆਸਣੁ ਸਾਧ
808 *b*	1	ਰਾਗਮਾਲਾ
809 *a*	1	ਹਕੀਕਤ ਰਾਹੁ ਮੁਕਾਮ
	16/17	ਸਿਆਹੀ ਕੀ ਬਿਧਿ ।

(3) [ਦਸਮ ਪਾਦਿਸ਼ਾਹ ਦਾ ਗ੍ਰੰਥ] BM No. Add. 21452

Dasham Padishah da Granth

or

The Book of the Tenth King, Gooroo Govind Singh

The first folio bears the following inscription :

Presented by Lewin Bowring Esq.,

11th June, 1856.

The manuscript bears no date of its compilation. It has 533 leaves of text (folios 539, including the index on ff. 3-6 and the title and note in English, as given above).

The *Zafarnama* is on leaves 518 *a*-520 *a* (folios 524 *a*-526 *a*), with *Hakāyats* on 526 *a*-539.

Lord Metcalfe*

[An Extract]

REV. THOMAS SMITH, D.D.

In June 1808, he [Charles Theophilus Metcalf (1785-1846)] was appointed by Lord Minto to one of the most important, and at the same time one of the most congenial offices in the whole service. At that time it was deemed necessary, as it has so often been deemed since, to 'make all snug' on our Northern and Western Frontiers, so as to be prepared for the expected storm of a French invasion. With this view Sir John Malcolm was sent to Persia, Mountstuart Elphinstone to Cabul, and Charles Metcalfe to Lahore. The selection of a man of 23 years of age, for a Mission of such mighty importance, and the entrusting him with so large discretionary powers was one of those great experiments on which few men like to pass a judgment, until light is cast upon them by the event. In March 1800, Metcalfe was waging the great "tea controversy" with his tutor at Eton; and recording in his journal, that but for their last despairing struggles, they should have failed. In June of the same year he was "sighing like a furnace" through love of Miss D—. In June 1801, he was entreating for permission to leave India for ever, and be appointed to the humblest situation in a Government office in England. But, lo : in 1803, he is charged with most important functions as the Representative of the Governor-General with the army, and now, in 1808, he is sent to cope with the old Lion of the Punjab ;—(he was not very old then, but we can never fancy him but as an old fellow). We do not remember, whether the author of Coningsby includes Metcalfe amongst the list of men who have signalized their early years by great exploits; but a more remarkable example could scarcely be furnished by universal history. To the enthusiasm of youth he united a wonderful amount of that sagacity which is generally regarded as the fruit of long experience, and the two rendered him a worthy representative of the English nation, at the court of a man, who, with all his faults, and they were legion could estimate these qualities. How much the *entente cordiale* that subsisted so long between the English and Runjit Sing, was due to the impression made upon him by this mission, it is of course impossible to determine: but it is not difficult to perceive, that an Envoy of a different character might have produced a different result, and have altered

*Culled from *Selections from the Calcutta Review*, Vol. VI, pp. 172-74; the *Calcutta Review*, Vol. XXIV, January, 1855, pp. 134-36.

the whole history of the Punjab during the last half century. By a union of firmness and conciliation, by carefully distinguishing between the spontaneous promptings of the noble savage's own mind, and, what was instilled into it by his interested courtiers, by maintaining his own dignity, and paying all proper respect to him to whom he was sent, he gradually overcame suspicion and prejudice, and succeeded in impressing Runjit with the conviction, that it was for his interest to maintain friendly terms with the Company's government. It is impossible for us to enter into the detail of the marchings and counter-marchings that Metcalfe was obliged to endure, following in the wake of this most erratic genius, nor yet into the alternations of hope and fear excited by his vacillations. The results of the mission are recorded in history and have been more than once referred to in the pages of the *Calcutta Review*. Suffice it to state here, that after delays and evassions innumerable, on the part of Runjit, after a display of most admirable temper, and firmness, and wisdom on the part of Metcafle, the conquests of Runjit on this side the Sutlej were given up to those from whom they had been wrested, and that a treaty of general amity was concluded on the 25th of April 1809, and signed at Umritsir by Runjit himself, and by C.T. Metcalfe on the part of the British Government. It is to us very pleasing to find in the midst of a long chapter filled with details of chicanery on the one-side, and uncompromising severity on the other, such a paragraph as the following, indicating that the harassing distractions of diplomacy had not stilled the beatings of the warm human heart in Metcalfe's breast.

In the middle of November he had received the distressing intelligence of the death of his aunt Richardson, to whom he was deeply attached. Some letters written by him at this time, to his afflicted uncle, and to his "dear, and now, alas! only aunt," Mrs. Monson, express the strength of his grief. He was eager at first to know whether his "dear, dear aunt, in her illness, ever thought of him." "With her mind," he added, "occupied by thoughts of her children and her beloved sisters, I cannot expect that she did." But all thoughts of his own sorrows passed away as he dwelt on the sufferings of the husband and sister, and prayed that they might be comforted and sustained by Him, who alone has power to wipe away all tears from our eyes. "May the giver of all things," he wrote to his uncle, "give you patience and fortitude to support you under the heavy pressure." And now, Lord, what is my hope ? Truly, my hope

is even in Thee. In the midst of life we are in the death, of whom may we seek succour, but of Thee, Oh Lord! Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord for they rest from their labours."

The Lion of the Punjab having at last shaken paws with his metaphorical brother of Britain, the negotiator left Umritsir on the 2nd of May, and on the 6th of June reached his old quarters at Delhi. His conduct was declared by the highest authority in the country to have "established a peculiar claim to public applause, respect and esteem. This highest authority desired to see the man who had so successfully conducted so difficult and delicate an enterprise, and instructed him to apply formally for leave of absence, but to start for Calcutta as soon as he could conveniently do so, without waiting for the official answer to his application. On the 8th of July, therefore, he reached Calcutta, where he was enabled to forget all the anxieties and turmoils of the last eventful months, in the society of his brother, who had come round from China, with his wife and litttle child. But he did not long enjoy this soothing society. Lord Minto, considering that the state of the army in the Madras Presidency required his presence there, resolved to leave Calcutta, and believing that there was no man who could render him so valuable service as Metcalfe, he had him appointed "Deputy Secretary to the Right Honourable the Governor-General during his Lordship's absence from the Presidency." Beyond a pleasant trip, and the advantage of enlarging his circle of acquaintances, no results seem to have flowed from this appointment. While at Madras, his heart was saddened by the tidings of the death of sister-in-law, to whom he was greatly attached. Theophilus Metcalfe, during his first visit to Calcutta, had married Miss Russell, a niece of Sir Henry Russell, one of the Judges of the Supreme Court. In the beginning of 1809, they came round to Culcutta for the benefit of her health, and Charles had all the best feelings of his heart called forth by a few weeks' intercourse with his sister-in-law, whom he describes as "really one of the most sensible, the most amiable, and the most virtuous of women." In the beginning of January he heard that she was dead, and that the widowed husband and the motherless little girl, were about to proceed to England. As Lord Minto did not leave Madras till May, and as Metcalfe in February spoke of his brother's being about to sail immediately for England, we presume that the brothers did not meet.

Minute by Lord Dalhousie*

28th February, 1856

[Extracts regarding the Panjab]

2. When I sailed from England in the winter of 1847 to assume the Government of India, there prevailed universal conviction among publicmen at home that permanent peace had at length been secured in the East. Before the summer came we were already involved in the Second Sikh War.

That were so, was due to no precipitation or fault of ours. The murder of the British Officers at Mooltan, and the open rebellion of the Dewan Moolraj, were not made pretext for quarrel with the Government of Lahore. On the contrary, the offence of the Dewan Moolraj was sedulously distinguished from national wrong. The Sikhs themselves were called upon to punish Moolraj as a rebel against their own sovereign, and to extract reparation for the British Government whose protection they had previously invoked.

But when it was seen that the spirit of the whole Sikh people was inflamed by the bitterest animosity against us—when chief after chief deserted our cause, until nearly the whole army, led by Sardars who had signed the Treaties, and by Members of the Council of Regency itself was openly arrayed against us—when, above all, it was seen that the Sikhs, in their eagerness for our destruction, had even combined in unnatural alliance with Dost Mahomed Khan and his Mahomedan tribes—it became manifest that there was no alternative left. The question for us was no longer one of policy or of expediency, but one of national safety.

Accordingly the Government put forth its power after a prolonged campaign, and a struggle severe and anxious, the Sikhs were utterly defeated and subdued, the Afghans were driven with ignominy through the mountains, and the Punjab became a British Province.

7. Maharaja Goolab Singh of Jummoo and Cashmere, so long as he lives, will never depart from the submissive policy, he announced,

* Culled from ***Selections from the Records of the Government of India, Home Department***, published by authority, Calcutta Gazette Office, Calcutta, 1856. Regd. No. 19(76); also *India Selection* No. 14.

with unmistakable sincerity in his air, when in Darbar at Wuzeerabad he caught my dress in his hands and cried aloud,—"Thus I grasp the skirts of the British Government, and I will never let go my hand ! "

And when, as must soon be, the Maharaja shall pass away, his son Meean Runbeer Sing, will have enough to do to maintain his ground against rivals of his own blood, without giving any cause of offence to a powerfull neighbour. which he well knows can crush him at its will.

12. During the eight years over which we now look, the British Territories in the East have been largely increased : within that time four kingdoms have passed under the sceptre of the Queen of England and various chiefships and separate tracts have been brought under her sway.

13. The kingdom of the Punjab and the kingdom of Pegu were the fruits of conquests, which followed upon the wars whose origin and issue have been already stated.

46. There are two incidents connected with the families of Native Princes which remarkably signalise the period we are now reviewing though they may not be regarded as of political moment.

47. The first is the adaption of the Christian faith by Maharaja Duleep Singh, the last of the rulers of the Punjab. The act was voluntary on the part of the boy, and, under the guidance of God's hands, was the result of his own uninfluenced convictions. It is also gratifying to be able to state, that his life hitherto has been strictly consistent with injunctions of the faith he professes.

48. The other incident is of a similar character. I refer to the Christian baptism of the daughter of the Ex-Raja of Coorg under the special protection of Her Majesty the Queen. The desire for the baptism of the young princess proceeded from the Raja himself and was intimated to me so early as in 1848.

88. Although the gigantic proportions of the Ganges canal might appear at first sight to dwarf all other similar works into insignificance, the Government during these years has undertaken other irrigation projects which must also be regarded as of great magnitude and importance.

So after the annexation of the Punjab, the sanction of the Government was given to the construction of a large canal with various branches, which should be fed by the waters of the river Ravee and which should be applied to the irrigation of the Manjha

(the tract which was chiefly inhabited by the Seikhs,) and of the rest of the Baree Doab.

The work has been carried on with vigour and success. The main line with its branches will extend over not less than 465 miles. Its stream will be at its head 120 feet in breadth and 5½ feet in depth, diminishing at its lower end to 15 feet in breadth and 2½ feet in depth. Its course is intended to be navigable; and even during the dry season of the year the canal head will roll down a body of water amounting to not less than 3,000 cubic feet in each second.

The report on the Punjab did not exaggerate the magnitude ro the importance of the works in the Baree Doab, when it stated that the new canal would be "second in India only to the great Ganges Canal, and equal, if not superior, to the finest irrigation canals in Europe. *[Second Punjab Report, para 424.]*

89. In the Mooltan District we found a vast number of smaller canals, fed by the periodical inundation from the rivers of the Punjab. They had been originally dug by the Pathan Governors, and had more recently been repaired by Sawun Mull, the father of Dewan Moolraj.

An officer was appointed to supervise the clearance of the canals and the distribution of the waters. "The canals," it is stated, "have been both enlarged and improved; and as regards conservancy and subsidiary management they are in more efficient order than ever they were, even in the palmy days of Sawun Mull."

The aggregate length of the inundation canals in the District of Mooltan is upwards of 600 miles. *[Second Punjab Report, para 429.]*

90. The inundation canals in the Derajat are of local importance; but the streams are troublesome, and the people have not been successful in their management of them.

A survey of all these canals was made, and the improvement of them is still in progress.

91. In the Cis-Sutlej Province, where surveys of great irrigation works were completed several years ago, no commencement has yet been made, or could have been made, while the expensive works already mentioned more urgently demanded the attention of the Government.

Some amendment, however, has been wrought in those arid regions by a proper distribution of the waters of the Gugger and Sursootee Rivers which was effected some years ago by the exercise

of the influence of the Government among the Chiefs of the Seikh protected states.

99 When the conquest of the Punjab gave the upper stream of the Indus into our possession, the Government was in hopes that private enterprise would place river steamers upon its streams even more abundantly than upon the Ganges. That hope was disappointed. The Government, therefore, endeavoured, by its own floatilla to establish a regular communication by steam between sea and the rivers of the Punjab.

Accordingly, river streamers have for several years periodically made the passage from Kurrachee to Mooltan, and there seems no reason to doubt that if the steamers were more numerous, more certainly accessible to the public, and better adapted to the shallow waters on which they ply, their services would be of infinite benefit to the frontier trade.

In the mean time, the channel of the Indus is becoming the great highway between Europe and the North-Western Province of our possessions. Troops arrive and depart from England by that route. Recruits are sent out and invalids are sent home each year by its stream, thus avoiding the long and weary march which must otherwise be made by Calcutta. Great quantities of heavy stores follow the same course. And passengers in large numbers now by preference seek by it a point of departure at Bombay.

A proposal has been made by the Government of Bombay for despatching two steamers on experimental trips from Kurrachee direct to Suez. The result of it, should it prove successful, will add importance and value to steam communication upon the Indus.

100. Surveys have been made of the principal rivers of the Punjab, with a view to the extension of river navigation still further into the interior of the province.

The Indus may certainly be navigated nearly as far as Kalabagh; and, at no great expense, it might be made navigable to Attock.

Occasional trips have been made by steamers in the rains as far as the military depot at Jhelum, and although the results of the surveys of the other streams cannot be said to be encouraging, there is no doubt that internal navigation may be extended much further within the Punjab than has yet been attempted.

120. When the Punjab became a British province, the prolongation of the Grand Trunk Road across its breadth was seen to be an object of primary importance. Accordingly the line has been carried

from Loodianah by Jullundur to the Beas, and thence by Umritsur to Lahore, and from Lahore by Wuzeerabad, Jhelum, Rawalpindee, and Attock to Peshawar.

Eevery natural difficulty that can be conceived has been encountered; vast expense has been incurred; but the road is rapidly approaching to completion, and by its usefulness will repay a thousand-fold the labour and treasure it has cost.

126. In the province of the Punjab, beside the great Trunk Road, from Lahore to Peshawur, to which reference has already been made, a vast extent of road has been constructed during the last seven years, for every different purpose, Military, Commercial and Local. To enumerate them would be tedious. A full description of them will be found in the First and Second Punjab Reports, and more especially Punjab Road Report, all of which have been printed.

178. The miscellaneous Legislation of the Government of India during the period has been very extensive and various.

Among the principal Acts that may be mentioned are the new Post Office Act; the Railway Act; the Electric Telegraph Act; Law for the Regulation of Joint Stock Companies; the Mofussil Municipal Act; the Municipal and Conservancy Act for the Presidency Towns; the Acts for the Regulation of Native Emigration; the Law Empowering the Government to levy Toll on Roads and Bridges; the Law for the Education of Minors; the Indian Marriage Act; the Law for the Naturalization of Aliens; the Law rendering British subjects liable to all Duties and Obligations incident to the Occupation of Land; the Apparentice Act; the Act for the Repeal of the Usury Laws.

179. Lastly, an Act has been passed for securing liberty of conscience and protection of converts, and especially of Christian Converts, against injury in respect of property or inheritance by reason of a change in their religious belief.

180. The review, which I proposed to take in this minute, of the events of the last eight years, and of the fruits they have produced, has now been brought to a close. No attempt has been made to embellish the narrative. It is for the most part a simple recital of what the Government of India has done. If the recital should seem dry in itself, it may be hoped that the results, which it exhibits, will not be thought by the Hon'ble Court to be unprofitable and disappointing.

One of the last, and not the least important, of those measures which have emanated from the Government of India during the past years, has been a resolution to require henceforth from the Government of every Presidency, from each Lieutenant-Governor and from the Chief Officer of every province, an Annual Report, narrating the incidents that may have occurred during the year within their several jurisdictions, and stating the progress that may have been made, and of all moment that may have been done, in each principal Department of the Civil and Military Administration.

My parting hope and prayer for India is, that, in all time to come, these reports from the Presidencies and Provinces under our rule may form, in each successive year, a happy record of peace, prosperity and progress.

28th February, 1856. (Signed) DALHOUSIE

[Lord Dalhousie was well known for the skill with which he used his pen and so twisted facts as to give an impression to his readers of the correctness of his statements This has been particularly so in the case of the Second Anglo-Sikh War and the so-called conquest of the Panjab wherein his part, according to many of his contemporaries, had not been above cavil. In this connection the attention of readers is invited to *The Private Correspondence relating to the Anglo-Sikh Wars*, pub. Sikh History Society, Amritsar/Patiala, 1955; Evans Bell, *The Annexation of the Punjab and Maharaja Duleep Singh*, Trubner & Co., London, 1882: etc. —Editor.]

Was the Kuka (Namdhari) Movement A Rebellion Against the British Government ?

DR GANDA SINGH

I have read the letters of Mr. B.S. Kamal of the Department of Journalism, Panjab University, Chandigarh, and Sardar Dalip Singh of Phagwara, published in the *Sikh Review* for February-March 1974, pp.84-85, wherein they have expressed their disagreement with my statement regarding the Kuka Movement being "a purely religious movement" and that "at no stage had the great Kuka leader said or done anything to encourage or connive at any crime. He had no political aims and mission and preached no rebellious ideas." *[Sikh Review*, December 1973, pp. 22-23; *The Panjab Past and Present, Vol. VII-1, April 1973. pp. x-xi.]*

Accordidg to them the Kuka Movement was a political "rebellion against the British rule" in India "to oust the British and to restore the Khalsa Raj." While Mr. Kamal has sought support for his views "in a representation made to the Lieutenant-Governor of the Punjab" by "a Christian Missionary" the Rev. B. Golaknath, and in the depositions of a couple of *lambardārs* and *zaildārs*, Sardar Dalip Singh has referred me to "the report of the British Official of the time."

The statement of the Rev. B. Golaknath that the Kuka sect did not wish well for the British Government is evidently based on the following "(seditious) verses" sung at their assemblies :

"Khalsa ji ka raji hosi
Unke age rahe na koi."

This so-called verse is a mutilated version of the first line of the well known couplet *Rāj Karegā Khālsā, Yāqī rāhe nā koé*, which is a common heritage of the Sikh community from the early days of the eighteenth century and forms the closing lines of the *Tankhwāh Nāmā* of Bhai Nand Lal, a devoted contemporary Sikh of Guru Gobind Singh.

This couplet was no innovation of the Kukas as mentioned above. It forms a part of the Sikh prayer *(Ardās)* and is always recited at the end of it. It had been recited during the days of the Mughals. It had been there during the days of the Misaldār Sardars and Maharaja Ranjit Singh and it was recited during the British rule and it is also recited today at the end of the Sikh prayer not only in the Sikh

Gurdwaras but also everywhere and at all times wherever and whenever the prayer is offered. Therefore, the reference to it by the Rev. B. Golaknath could have no special import, particularly in respect of the Kukas' attitude towards the British Government.

As regards the statements of *lambardārs* and *zaildārs*, the less said the better. They are petty screws in the machinery of the Government. They always act in the way the Government senior officials wish them to. They are generally not only the spies and informants of the government and its agents provocateur, but are also ever-ready tools to act as prosecution or defence witnesses for the officials as the case may be.

To examine and test the veracity and integrity of the statements of the *lambardār* and *zaildār* informants of the Government, I would take only one instance and that too of Sukhoo *lambardār* of Bhaini whom Mr. Kamal has cited in support of his contention. This *lambardār* belonged to the village of Baba Ram Singh, and he was evidently prompted in reporting against the Kuka leader by his old personal enemity against him. It is clearly stated in his statement forwarded by Major Parsons, Deputy Commissioner, the 12th February, 1872, that he "had enemity with Ram Singh prior to Sambat 1920 on account of a house and in 1920 on account of reporting him to Government." He then says that he had become a Kuka and made up with Ram Singh. This statement, in further continuation, records that the "Informant, [Sukhoo *lambardār*] makes this report on account of being a *lambardār* and Government well wisher." [See *Kuka Papers*, pp. 226-7.] Here is a *lambardār* who claims to be a Kuka and a well-wisher of the British Government at the same time, and is spying for the Government and reporting against his own religious guide and leader whom the Kukas called *Gurū* and *Sat-Gurū* ! Could hypocrisy and untruth go further, and could the statements of such people be relied upon for faithful historical study ?

As such, and in the light of day to-day experience about these people, no student of history can be persuaded to place any reliance on the depositions of *lambardārs* and *zaildārs* as sources of objective history. Moreover, the loose talk of a Kuka here and a Kuka there, fed on the garbled versions of the *Sau-Sākhī* manuscript, containing prophecies interpolated by unknown clever people of dubious character, could not be taken seriously, however frightful it might have been to some British officials frightened by the Mutiny of 1857.

The statement of Mr. Douglas Forsyth in his report that "the

whole of Punjab was apportioned into about 70 *Subās* or provinces through which the Gurus' lieutenants actively itinerated preaching the speedy restoration of the Khalsa rule" is only a betrayal of his ignorance of history. There was nothing new in the division of the country into various sections for the purposes of *prachār* of Sikhism in different parts of India. It had been inherited by the Sikh community from the days of the early Gurus. Guru Nanak during his odysseys had established *sangats* in different places in the charge of leaders called *Manjī*, because they were seated on *manjī* or a cot when preaching to the people. After Guru Nanak, the number of *Manjis* rose to 22, in addition to 52 *pīrhās* or parishes [*Mahān Kosh*, p.2533-4]. This organization of preachers gradually progressed into the *Masand* system referred to by *Maubid* Zulfiqar Ardistani (Azur Sasani), the Zorastarian author of the *Dabistān-i-Mazāhib* in his chapter on the *Nānak-panthīs*. *Maubid* Zulfiqar was personally known to Guru Hargobind and Guru Har Rai. The Kuka *Subās* set up by Bhai. Ram Singh for the propagation of his Sikh revivalist Mission were only an extension of the *Manjī*, *Pīrhā* or the *Masand* system.

That some of the *subās* wished for the *Rāj Karégā Khālsā*, as predicted in a *Sau-Sākhī* manuscript and as it was sung as a part of the Sikh prayer at their congregations, is not surprising and extraordinary, but there is nothing on record to say that any of the *subās* anywhere organized active rebellion against the British Government for the restoration of the Sikh *Rāj*. As mentioned above, some of the Kukas only attacked the cow-killing butchers' compounds at Amritsar, Raikot and Malerkotla, and in their misdirected frenzy killed some of the butchers there. This could by no stretch of imagination or reasoning be called a *rebellion* against the British Government to oust the British and to restore the *Khālsā Rāj*.

The butchers were their fellow-citizens of India and had as much right to live in the country as sons of the soil as the Kukas themselves. Their profession of butchery was as lawful as agriculture, carpentry, shopkeeping or trade followed by most of the Kakus, and the Kukas had no right to interfere with it, much less to harass and murder the butchers in an organized manner. This action of theirs amounted to nothing less than dacoity with murder, as the trying magistrates called it. This was a most heinous crime against a weaker section of the law-abiding citizens. No secular government can, in honesty and fairness, be partial to any one community in banning the killing of a particular animal. If the Hindus or Kukas

do not like the cows to be killed, the Muhammadans and Harijan *Chūrhās*, on the other hand, are against the killing of pigs and hares respectively, freely killed by others. If a group of Muhammadans were to organize a band of theirs and were to kill some Kukas or Christians, could it be called a rebellion of theirs against the British Government to oust the British and to restore the Mughal *Sultanat* ? No.

Moreover, the butchers of Amritsar, Raikot or Malerkotla were neither the agents of the British Government, nor had they in any way been instrumental in its establishment in India, or in the Panjab, to have earnt any chastisement at the hands of the Kuka zealots.

I would love to be enlightened about "the bright instances of Kukas' rebellion against the British rule," which Mr. Kamal has in mind and which, to his surprise, I have "overlooked." These instances, I request, should be subtantiated by reliable documentary evidence and not by sentimental emotions which do not carry much weight with an objective student of history.

The founder of the Kuka or Namdhari movement was Baba Balak Singh of Hazro who had been inspired by *Sāīn Bhagat* Jawahir Mall of Rawalpindi. In the words of one of his descendants, Bhagat Lakshman Singh :

> "Bhagat Jawahir Mall...was of a religious bent of mind. Having been brought up under Sikh influence he had learnt to cherish *Gurbāni* very dearly which he loved to read and recite. Not unlike his father, he spent much of his time in meditation and prayer. ...he collected around him a number of disciples. The most distinguished of these was the well known saint Bhai Balak Singh, the *Gurū* of the famous Baba Ram Singh who subsequently set up a sect of his own called *Kookas* or *Nāmdhārīs*...and he [Ram Singh] was the last person to have taken any serious interest in the politics of the day. He appeared to be a man of God through and through" [*Bhagat Lakshman Singh Autobiography*, pp. 3-5].

This is enough to show that the Kuka movement was purely religious from the very beginning. But, afraid of the occurrences during the Indian Mutiny in 1857, the British Government looked upon it with suspicion and secretly watched it like every other movement or assemblage of people in the country, however intensely religious it was.

To begin with, the followers of Baba Balak Singh, including Ram Singh, himself, and of Baba Ram Singh, were known as *Jagiāsī*

(Seekers after Truth), or *Abhiāsī* (practisers of the Lord's Name, devoted to meditation). In a *Memorandum regarding Guru Ram Singh of a new sect of Sikhs—Jagiāsīs*—dated Muree, 28th June, 1863, forwarded by Major J. W. Younghusband, Officiating Inspector-General of Police, Punjab, to all Deputy Inspectors-General of Police, it is recorded :

> "The leading features of the doctrine he teaches are as follows : Abolishes all distinctions of caste among Sikhs; advocates indiscriminate intermarriage of all classes; enjoins the marriage of widows, all of which he performs himself ;"...
>
> The *Granth* is their only accepted inspired volume. The brotherhood may be known by the tie of their pagris, "*Sidhā pag*," ... ...
>
> According to Mani Ram of Jullundur :
>
> In common with all other Sikhs, doubtless, Ram Singh wishes their rule back again, but he does not preach this. Considers him unquestionably a prophet, and believes his preaching to be entirely of a religious nature.
>
> The following is a translation [of a circular of Ram Singh] : "*Shrī Wāh Gurū jī ke Khālsā* : *Shrī Wāh Gurū jī ke Fatteh*" to all Sikhs...Whoever commits adultery, theft, &c., let him not come to the *Darbar*, and if he tries to force his way, pray to the Guru to stop him. Sing the *Granth* together, and the praise of the Diety; be afraid of none; abuse no one. ...Your children should be educated in the precepts of the *Granth*. ... [*Kuka Papers*, pp. 3, 4, 7.]

In his *Minute* dated 30th June, 1863, on the above *Memorandum* of the Officiating Inspector-General of Police, the Offg. Secretary to Government, Punjab (T.D. Forsyth), writes :

> 2. From the Reports now submitted by many officers, it appears that Ram Singh is endeavouring to effect a reform in the Sikh religion and some of his doctrines and precepts are not only harmless, but also beneficial.
>
> 4. Ram singh gives out that he does not seek an earthly kingdom and his preaching, so for as has been ascertained, does not tend to sedition. *[Ibid, p. 8.]*

This statement of Baba Ram Singh is enough to contradict the loose talk of some of his followers who, no doubt, at times blurted out under the influence of a *Sau-Sākhī*, that *Khālsā Rāj* was to come back under Ram Singh.

In June 1863, Mr. Kinchant thus describes the Kuka articles of belief in *A Brief Account of the Kuka Sect* [*Kuka Papers*, pp. 10-11] :

> Govind Singh's *Granth* is the only true one, written by inspiration, and is the only sacred writing extent. Govind Singh is the only Guru. Any person, irrespective of caste or religion, can be admitted a convert. Sodis, Bedis, Mahants, Brahmins and such like are imposters, as none are Gurus except Govind Singh. Debidwaras, Shibdwaras and Mandars are a means of extoration, to be held in contempt and never visited. Idols and idol-worship are insulting to God, and will not be forgiven. Converts are allowed to read Govind Singh's *Granth*, and no other book.

The Kukas not unoften sang the following verses in their assemblies, says the above *Brief Account :*

(12) *Marhī Massītān dhā ke kar deo maidānā,*
Pahle māro Pīr Banoī, phīr māro Sultānā,
Ummat sabhi Muhammadī khap jai maidānā,
Sunat koī nā kar sakke kamban Turkānā,
Bhainī Satgurū Jagiā, aur jhūt jahānā. [*Ibid*, *p. 12.*]

The recitation of these verses was very popular with the Kukas. They not only incited them to desecrate tombs and crematoriums and to destory the graves and mausoleums of saints *Pīr* Banoi and Sultān (Sakhī Sarwar), but also preached against the entire community of the Muslims *(Ummat Sabhī Muhammadī)* and their religious rite of circumcision. This might have been interpreted into an act of Kuka rebellion if the then government of the country were Pathan or Mughal. But, unfortunately for the Kukas, it was British.

Religiously speaking it was in bad taste to recite such verses. One may or may not reverence or worship tombs and mausoleums, but no one has the right to desecrate or demolish the places of other people's worship. How would the Kukas like the Hindus or Muslims organize themselves into batches and recite similar verses against the entire Kuka community, their saints and leaders and their places of worship ?

In *The history of the Kukas during 1867*, submitted to the Government under No. 11-183, dated 20th January, 1868, it is mentioned under classification I, *The Progress of the Sect in the Proselytism* :

> About the same time [January 1867] a communication was received from Major Mercer, Deputy Commissioner of

> Sialkot, giving the result of his inquiries, and stating his opinion that the movement was a purely religious one ...
>
> They all seem to have a great respect for the tenets of the sect, and agree that it is an effort to restore the Sikh religion to its original purity, and to do away with the innovations which have crept into it, such as consulting Brahmins as to the proper day for marriages, &c. From what they say, the belief of the sect appears to be a pure deism...
>
> All with whom I have conversed on the subject laugh at the idea of the movement having any political significance, and regard it simply as a religious one. There is no doubt that all Sikhs, and the Kukas among them, would be glad to see their own rule re-established ; but I do not think that any danger is to be apprehended from the spread of this sect. ... [*Kuka Papers*, 27.]
>
> It was considered that there was no cause shown to interfere with Ram Singh; and that laxity of morals on the part of his younger converts could not be regarded per se as proof of evil designs on the part of their head teacher. [*Ibid*, p. 28.]

Nothing unlawful, much less seditious, came to the notice of the Government throughout this period in the conduct of the Kuka leader Baba Ram Singh with the result that :

> During the year the restrictions placed on Ram Singh's movements were withdrawn," says the IGP, Punjab, and "he is now allowed to go where he pleases. ... the conduct of Ram Singh and his followers has been orderly and that hitherto he has proved himself to be worthy of indulgence shown him. [*Ibid*, p. 28.]

Minor offences like desecration of idols, tombs, etc., however, came to be committed by some of the over zealous Kukas under fanatical religious influence, but they were in violation of Baba Ram Singh's instructions. According to the Inspector-General of Police, Punjab, in the document referred to above :

> Colonel McAndrew, Deputy Inspector-General of Police, Lahore Circle, took occasion, on his visit to Anandpur, in the Hoshiarpur district, to point out to Ram Singh the discredit such outrages brought on his faith ; he solemnly affirmed he had issued the strictest orders to his followers

against interfering with shrines or tombs, and expressed a wish that the offenders might be punished. [*Ibid*, p. 32.]

According to the *Account* of Colonel McAndrew, Deputy Inspector-General of Police of Lahore, of the visit of Baba Ram Singh to the fair at Anandpur in March 1867 :

> ... Ram Singh stated his object was to perform the *darshan* (worship) at the shrine of Guru Govind Singh ; but that he was ready to do whatever we ordered ; that if we objected he would return as he came. [*Ibid*, p. 34.]

Col. McAndrew was also present at Amritsar during the Diwali festival. He says in his *Memorandum* :

> I enquired from Sirdar Mangal Singh (Ramgarhia), Honorary Magistrate and guardian of the temple, and from several other Sikh gentlemen, what they thought of Ram Singh ; all stated that they looked on him as well disposed and inoffensive man, who believed in what he taught; but they did not express such a favorable opinion regarding some of his Mahants or subhas.

Bābā Ram Singh permitted no crime to be committed by the Kukas and he strenuously forbade them, but in spite of it, some of the Kukas in their misguided zeal desecrated Hindu idols, Muslim tombs, etc., and killed a number of butchers at Amritsar and Raikot. But their biggest crime was their attack against the butchers of Malerkotla which resulted in 65 Kukas to be blown from the guns on January 17 and 18, 1872, and in the deportation of Baba Ram Singh and a number of his *Subās*.

During the Māghī *Melā*, when some of the Kukas, mostly of Patiala State, planned to march against the butchers of Malerkotla on January 13, 1872, and approached Ram Singh to lead the enterprise, he advised them to desist from their dangerous design. Sarfraz Khan, Deputy Inspector Police of Sanehwal, who was present at Bhaini on the occasion, reported this to the Deputy Commissioner of Ludhiana, Mr. L. Cowan, the same night. Writing to the Commissioner and Superintendent, Ambala Division (Mr. T.D. Forsyth), on January 15, 1872, under his letter No. 14, the Deputy Commissioner says :

> He stated to me that Ram Singh, the leader of the Kukas, went up to these men with a turban round his neck and entreated of them not to create a disturbance; that they would not listen to him ; and that Ram Singh then came to

> the Deputy Inspector and reported to him that these men were up to mischief and that he had no control over them. This occurred about 2 p.m. on the 13th. Ram Singh named Hira Singh and Lena Singh of Sakroudi, in the Patiala State, as the leaders of this gang. [*Kuka Papers*, p. 77.]

This is also confirmed by another letter No. 15 of January 17, 1872, of Mr. Cowan to the Commissioner saying in paragraph 2 thereof :

> Ram Singh gave intimation to the Deputy Inspector of Police, Sarfraz Khan, that this gang meditated mischief, and he himself begged of them not to create a disturbance at Bhaini. [*Ibid* p. 92.]

Not only this. Ram Singh also deputed one of his chief men Lakha Singh, accompanied by another Sahib Singh, to inform the Deputy Commissioner himself at Ludhiana.

In the words of Baba Ram Singh :

> I then at once told the *thānādār* of Sanehwal that these Kukas intended to commit some outrage, and would not listen to me, the fact must be reported to Government. I then sent Lakha Singh, who lived with me, to Ludhiana with instructions that, if the matter was not reported to Government by the *thānādār*, he should do so. [Statement of Ram Singh before the Commissioner of Ambala on January 18, 1872. [*Ibid.*, p. 136.]

This speaks volumes for the law-abiding nature of the great Kuka leader who abhored crime from the bottom of his heart. He knew no hypocrisy and played no double game. He was an honest and a truthful man heartily devoted to God and godliness, seeking to shed nobody's blood which is unavoidable in a rebellion. So noble-hearted was he that he would not use a harsh word for anyone, or raise his little finger to hurt anyone, much less kill anyone even in a dream. We have on record that he went to the extent of apologizing to a police sergeant whom a Kuka, Lakha Singh by name, had abused at Amritsar when Baba Ram Singh visited that holy shrine on the occasion of Diwali fair on October 27, 1867. According to the official report of the IGP to the Secretary to the Government, Punjab, under No. 11-183 dated 20th January, 1868, under Section III, *Meetings* [*Kuka Papers*, p. 37] :

> The latter [Lakha Singh] was the only man who misconducted himself during the fair. He abused a Police Sergeant

who stopped all in excess of 50 from entering the temple on the 28th. Inspector Ibrahim Khan, however, brought him to his senses at once; and Ram Singh apologized to the sergeant.

As Baba Ram Singh could maintain no touch with the batch of Kukas who had left Bhaini for Malerkotla on January 13, 1872, he could exercise no influence on their activities. In fact, in going to Malerkotla they had acted in defiance of his wishes. He could only shed tears of blood on their helpless lot at the hands of Mr. L. Cowan, the Deputy Commissioner, Ludhiana, and Mr. T. Douglas Forsyth, the Commissioner of Ambala, who, after the Malerkotla occurrences, had them tied to the mouths of guns and then had them blown away in the parade-ground of Malerkotla on January 17-18, 1872.

It may be mentioned here that the number of Kukas who marched from Bhaini for Malerkotla on January 13 was hardly 150 at the outside. "No one joined them anywhere on their march." In fact half of them deserted their comrades by the time they arrived at Rarr in the Patiala territory where only 68 of them, in the words of Mr. Forsyth, surrendered to the Patiala authorities.

Mr. Cowan and Mr. Forsyth exaggerated the import of this affair beyond all proportions and so represented it to the Government as if the danger of an insurrection was imminent. The Government of India, however, did not accept their version as true. Writing to the Government of the Punjab, the Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department, said in his letter No. 289 of February 8, 1872 :

> 7. These statements show that no immediate danger was to be apprehended; that, if the crime was an attempt at insurrection, it had failed; that the insurgents were "completely cowed."...
>
> 8. The impression which the papers leave on His Excellency in Council is that Mr. Cowan ordered the execution not under the pressure of immediate urgent necessity, but because he thought that it might possibly have the effect of preventing an insurrection of a more general kind...
>
> 9. ...and of this His Excellency has no evidence whatever in the papers before him...
>
> 10. The apprehension that a general insurrection was imminent and could be averted by the means taken, and not otherwise, might have effect of excusing Mr. Cowan to a great or less extent if it rested upon reasonable grounds, but

the papers disclose only slight, if any, grounds for such an apprehension...

11. With regard to Mr. Forsyth's proceedings, they would appear to have been legal but His Excellency in Council fails to perceive the necessity for such extreme and indiscriminate severity as Mr. Forsyth displayed. [*Kuka Papers, p.181.*]

During this time Baba Ram Singh was summoned twice by the Deputy Commissioner—once at Malaudh to meet him and a second time to meet the Commissioner at Ludhiana—and every time he promptly obeyed the orders. As he had neither committed any crime himself, nor was he guilty of abetment therein or of connivance at it, but had actually informed the Government authorities of the criminal intentions of some of the Kukas who had gone out of his control and had threatened to kill him* and some of his relatives on their return from their enterprise, he felt innocent in the affair. Even when he was arrested and ordered to be exiled from the Panjab, he accepted it with stoic calmness, resigning himself to the Will of the Almighty like a truly religious man.

On receipt of a telegram from the Secretary to Government, Delhi, dated 22nd January, 1872, Mr. L. Cowan, Offg. Deputy Commissioner, Ludhiana, "deputed Mr. Jackson, Asstt. Superintendent of Police to make a thorough search of Ram Singh's premises at Bhaini for arms and treassure." On his return Mr. Cowan reported to the Commissioner, Ambala Division, in his letter No. 26, of January 26, 1872, saying:

2. Mr. Jackson has returned, and reports that he has made a complete search, digging up ground to a considerable depth wherever he thought it likely that arms or treasure might be buried, but that no trace of either has been found.

3. .. He fed large numbers of persons, and it is not believed that he accumulated treasure. [*Kuka Papers*, p. 124.]

This falsified the allegations of some of the *lambardārs* who had been reporting to the officials that Ram Singh had burried under ground two lakhs of rupees and a number of arms. This is another

* "They came to Bhaini prepared to force their leader to sanction the enterprize and to head an insurrection, and in fact there is no doubt but that these men threatened Ram Singh that they would kill him if he did not join." "This part of Ganga Parshad's statement agrees with what Ram Singh said to me at Ludhiana."

Sd.T.D. Forsyth. [*Kuka Papers*, p. 156.]

proof that the *lambardārs* of the neighbouring villages had been making false reports against the Kuka leader and creating baseless panic among the Government officials, who in turn magnified these reports and allegations and wrongly accused Baba Ram Singh of the political aim and mission of his Kuka movement.

It is true that in common with many other Sikhs, Baba Ram Singh at times believed in the prophecies of the *Sau-Sākhī*, ascribed to Guru Gobind Singh, that the *rāj* of the *Khālsā* would soon be restored (with perhaps himself as its head). And who is there among the Sikhs who would not honestly wish for the re-establishment of the *Khālsā Rāj* in its real sense ? Even today, it is the democratic right of every person or party to aspire for political power in the country. But the question is: "Is it historically correct to say that the *real* aim and mission of the movement, of which Baba Balak Singh was the founder as *Jagiāsi* and *Abhiāsi*, and of which Baba Ram Singh was the accredited leader as *Nāmdhārī* (wrongly nicknamed as *Kuka*), were political for the restoration of the *Khālsā Rāj* ?" The second question is: "Were the attacks of the Kukas against the cow-killing butchers at Amritsar, Raikot and Malerkotla, and murdering them an act of rebellion against the British Government in India for ousting the British from the country ?" The answer to both the questions on the basis of official records of the time is 'No'.

The Government of India—the Viceroy and the Governor-General in Council—after a careful study and close scrutiny of the official reports and other relevant documents also came to the same conclusion and removed Mr. L. Cowan, the Offg. Deputy Commissioner, Ludhiana, from service, and removed Mr. T. Douglas Forsyth from the Commissionership of Ambala to another province, not in future to be placed in a similar position.

Conveying the 'final orders' of the Government of India—of His Excellency the Governer-General in Council—'on the summary executions of Kuka prisoners at Malerkotla' to the Government of the Punjab, Mr. E.C.Bayley Esq., C.S.I., Secretary to the Government of India, Home Department, wrote to the Secretary to the Government of Punjab:

> 15. In the first place 'His Excellency is of opinion that Mr. Cowan's clear duty was to have detained the prisoners in custody until they could be proceeded against in due course of Law. A large proportion of them were badly wounded. They had surrendered to very inferior numbers, and were

under the guard of a considerable military force, ...Under these circumstances their illegal and indiscriminate execution was a measure for which there was no excuse. His Excellency in Council cannot regard as an excuse Mr. Cowan's belief that the execution was politically expedient. In fact that he set aside the existing law, because he thought it expedient to do so in the particular case, is one of the elements in the offence which His Excellency in Council considers Mr. Cowan to have committed...

19. The executions, therefore, cannot be reconciled with the spirit of Mr. Forsyth's instruction, and took place before any reply had been received to a telegraphic message sent by Mr. Cowan the day before to the Punjab Government for leave to execute four men only ...

20. .. seven men were tied to the guns...It was Mr. Cowan's clear duty to obey Mr. Forsyth's order in a case in which the lives of six or seven persons were at stake, and where the act forbidden was upon the face of it illegal. ...

22. ... His Excellency is under the painful necessity of affirming that the course followed by Mr. Cowan was illegal, that it was not palliated by any public necessity...

23. ... Under all these circumstances, His Excellency in Council is compelled to direct that Mr. Cowan be removed from the service.

29. In conformity with the views enunciated above, His Excellency in council is of opinion that, while Mr. Forsyth is undoubtedly guiltless of any illegal action, he has in no small degree identified himself with the errors committed by Mr. Cowan; that he failed to discern his duty as counsellor to a Native Government in a serious emergency; and that he acted eventually in a manner inconsistent with the recognized policy of the Government of India.

30. His Excellency in Council considers that Mr. Forsyth's conduct will be adequately dealt with by his removal from the Commissionership of Ambala to a position in another Province in which he will not have to superintend the judicial proceedings of any Native State, and by an expression of the opinion of the Government of India that he ought not in future to be placed in a position in which he would be called upon to exercise similar control and superintendence.

[*Kuka Papers*, pp. 251-2, 254.]

It is clear from the above observations based on official reports and documents, that the Kuka movements as founded by Baba Balak Singh—then called Jagiāsi, *Abhiāsi*, and developed by Baba Ram Singh as Nāmdhārī (devotees of God)—wrongly nicknamed as Kuka—"was a purely religious movement aiming at the revival of the Sikh faith," and that "at no stage had the *great Kuka leader* [Baba Ram Singh] said or done anything by word or deed to encourage or connive at any crime. He had no political aims and mission and preached no rebellious ideas." It is true that, in common with many other Sikhs, nourished on the predictions of the *Sau-Sākhī*, he wished for the restoration of the *Khālsā Rāj* but there is not a single official report that he ever preached sedition or rebellion for its materialization. This is what can be safely said as far as Baba Ram Singh was concerned.

But the same cannot be said about all the Kukas. All of them were not truly religious, nor were they sincerely obedient to Baba Ram Singh, their 'Gurū.' Some of them, unfortunately, were criminal-minded and are recorded to have insulted him, going to the extent of threatening to kill him if he did not join them in their criminal plans for the killing of butchers. The unlawful activities of such men could certainly not be taken as representing the aims and mission of Baba Ram Singh's *Nāmahārī* (Kuka) movement. It would be a cruel traversity of facts to hold the entire movement or the majority of the *Nāmdhāris* responsible for the 'dacoity with murder' cases (in the technical language of the trying magistrates) at Amritsar, Raikot and Malerkotla.

I have not come across anywhere in any official or non-official records of over one hundred years that "The Britishers regarded Kukas as their enemy No. 1." Such words could not have fallen from the pen or lips of an Englishman except in a very very grave situation which the Kukas' killing of a few butchers had not created.

The Kukas had not raised their little finger against any Government official; they had not assaulted, much less killed, a single Britisher anywhere in the country during their so-called revolt; they had not even disobeyed any civil or police official or refused to pay their land revenue. Their leaders Baba Balak Singh and Baba Ram Singh had at no stage preached sedition or raised the standard of revolt against the British Government. Baba Ram Singh more than once forbade his followers to create disturbance anywhere or commit

any crime against any individual or community on religious or any other ground. He himself fully co-operated with police and civil authorities during his visits to Anandpur, Amritsar, etc., and, when desired, went to Malaud and Ludhiana to see the Deputy Commissioner and the Commissioner and quietly accepted the orders of his exile from the Panjab. He did not go underground to escape his deportation, nor did he try to escape from the places of his detention.

The Kukas incited no army regiments to kill their British officers and attacked no military cantonments or police stations. They raided no Government treasuries and looted no British or Indian banks. They set fire to no Government offices or residential buildings and assaulted no inmates thereof. They cut no telegraph wires and pulled down no poles to disrupt their lines of communication. They ambushed no police or army parties sent out against them and offered no resistance to their captors at the last stage. Even when they saw in the Malerkotla parade-ground their comrades tied to the mouths of the guns and blown away from them, they did not rush out as a body to attack their executioners. There was only one solitary instance of a youngman darting out at Mr. Cowan, seizing him by the beard and trying to strangle him, and when he attacked some of the Indian States' officers, he was cut down with swords.

The above speaks for itself in proclaiming in unmistakeable language that there was nothing in the activities of the *Nāmdhārī* leaders or their followers that could be taken for or construed as a rebellion against the British Government.

As for the foreign visits of a few of the Kukas—not more than five or six—the official reports give no detailed accounts as to their real intentions. Mr. Lepl Griffin, the Offg. Secretary to the Government of the Punjab, writing to the Secretary, Government of India, Home Department, in his letter No. 930 of February 22, 1872, says :

> 7. There is no evidence...to show with what precise intention or with what success Kuka emigrants have visited distant parts of India or States on its northern border; but it may be safely presumed that the intention was political and not religious. ...
>
> 8. The wild boasts and predictions of uneducated and fanatical men should not, the Lieutenant-Governor observes, be accepted as true or have assigned to them a value which they do not possess;...[*Kuka Papers*, p. 225.]

One should not be surprised if in their visits to Nepal and Kabul

they wished to have some information about Maharani Jind Kaur (the mother of Maharaja Duleep Singh) who had taken shelter in Nepal after her escape from India or they wished to know something about the Maharaja himself who, according to the *Sau-Sākhī* predictions, was expected to come to India, through Kabul, with the help of the Russians. But all this turned out to be nothing more than wishful thinking. Seven years later in 1879, one Gurcharan Singh, said to be a Kuka, contacted some Russian officials in Russian Turkestan—again in pursuance of the *Sau-Sākhī* predictions—with no tangible result.

In 1887 Maharaja Duleep Singh himself went to Russia, met a number of high officials there and offered to transfer his allegiance to the Russian Emperor. But noting came out of it. He could not even have an interview with the Emperor, and he returned disappointed to France where he died in Paris on October 22, 1893.

The efforts of some of the Kukas to contact Maharaja Duleep Singh seem to have been without the knowledge and permission of their leader Baba Ram Singh who denounced him as a beef-eater in one of his letters from his exile in Burma and, in another, asked his followers to treat him as 'a foreigner' if ever he came to India. The actual words of Baba Ram Singh were :

> ਅਰ ਦਲੀਪ ਸਿਘ ਨੂੰ ਅਰਦਾਸ ਨਹੀਂ ਭੇਜਣੀ, ਉਨੇ ਤਾਂ ਗਾਇ ਖਾ ਲਈ ਹੈ ਸਾਡਾ ਕੀ ਕੰਮ ਕਰਨਾ ਹੈ ਉਸ ਨੇ ॥......
>
> ———
>
> ਸੋ ਭਾਈ ਦਲੀਪ ਸਿਘ ਆਊਗਾ, ਤਾਂ ਤੁਸਾਂ ਜਾਨਣਾ ਕੋਈ ਪ੍ਰਦੇਸੀ ਆ ਰਿਹਾ ਹੈ ।

Translated into English these would read as :

...And do not send (any) letter to Dalip Singh. He has eaten beef. What good is he going to accomplish for us ? ...

So, brothers, if Dalip Singh comes [to India] you take it as if some foreigner is coming. [Tehal Singh, *Hukam-nāme*, p. 17; *Kukiān dī Vithyā*, letters 15, 6, pp. 252, 234]

Now about the postal arrangements of the Kukas. It is not correct to presume that the Kukas had set up any parrallel postal system of their own in opposition to that of the Government. No such thing was done. As during the tours of Baba Ram Singh in the rural areas it was not possible, in the absence of adequate Government postal arragements, to inform the people in due time in all the villages, the Kukas generally sent the desired information through their own volunteer messengers who, where necessary, carried the messages by relays. A look at the list of Post Offices in the eighteen sixties and

seventies would show that the sub and branch post offices in the Panjab were then few and far between, with the result that there were quite a large number of villages which were visited by postmen hardly once a week. There was no alternative, therefore, but to send the information of the Kuka assemblages in the far flung villages through volunteer messengers. This method was followed in many parts of the Panjab up to the first two decades of the present century, when I myself and some of my friends acted as volunteer-messengers to small and distant villages in the Hariana—Hoshiarpur—areas for the Singh Sabha assemblages. It was a necessity of those days and not a parallel postal system.

Baba Ram Singh, to my mind, was a great soul, capable of much greater achievements in the field of religious revivalism among the Sikhs and in winning them back to the old ways of life inculcated by the great Gurus. But his mission and plans, unfortunately, came to be thwarted by the ill-directed enthusiasm of some of his followers who, under Brahmanical influences, involved themselves in murderous attacks against the cow-killing butchers which the Government of the Panjab punished with undue severity under false and exaggerated apprehensions. The worst result of this all was the unjustifiable banishment of Baba Ram Singh from the Panjab and his death in a far off land.

Date of the visit of Guru Amardas to Kurukshetra

DR. BALBIR SINGH

(1) Guru Amar Das (1479-1574) was the third Guru of the Sikhs. The period of his pontificate (Guruship) was limited to the duration of A.D. 1552 to 1574. During this interval he took a trip to Kurukshetra from where he further proceeded to Hardwar etc. It is recorded that the object of the sojourn was to preach, bless and to fulfil the general purpose of bringing about the spiritual regeneration of the common people. No authentic date of this journey is available in the traditional sources of Sikh annals. The authenticity of this visit is, however, confirmed by the fact that there is a hymn in *Guru Granth Sahib*, by the fourth Guru, bearing testimony to this event [*Tukhari Chhant*, p. 1116].

(2) The hymn has its own significance. Read together with the commentary on it by *Tika Faridkot* it assumes a momentous aspect of historical bearing. From this study it becomes clear that when the Guru went to Kurukshetra it was the occasion of the solar eclipse. It further points out that this was a rare opportunity, as when it occurred, it was the ruling conjunction of the *Nakshatra Abhijit*.

(3) It may be of interest to point that a *Nakshatra* has been defined as an asterism in the moon's path of lunar mansion. There are thus 28 *Nakshatras* which occupy relatively fixed positions in the sky and which lie in the monthly circumambulatory course of the moon. The list as given in the original Sanskrit text is as follows :-

अश्विनी भरणी चैव कृत्तिका रोहिणी मृगः ।
आर्द्रा पुनर्वसु पुष्यस्ततोऽश्लेषामघा तथा ॥
पूर्वफाल्गुनिका तस्मादुत्तराफाल्गुनी ततः ।
हस्तचित्रा तथा स्वाती विशाखा तदनंतरम् ॥
अनुराधा ततो ज्येष्ठा ततो मूलं निगद्यते ।
पूर्वाषाढोत्तराषाढस्त्वभिजिच्छ्रवणस्तथा ॥
धनिष्ठा शततारास्या पूर्वाभाद्रपदा ततः ।
उत्तराभाद्रपाच्चैव रेवत्येतानि भानि च ॥

(ज्योतिषभास्कर, पृष्ठ 16.)

Dr. Balbir Singh, Ph. D. (London), D. Litt., 20 Pritam Road, Dehra Dun.

These are tabulated hereunder, written in plain Roman script :-

1. Asvini
2. Bharani
3. Krittiki
4. Rohini
5. Mrigasira
6. Ardra
7. Punarvasu
8. Pushya
9. Aslesha
10. Magha
11. Purva Phalguni
12. Uttra Phalguni
13. Hasta
14. Chitra
15. Svati
16. Visakha
17. Anuradha
18. Jyeshtha
19. Mula
20. Purva Ashadha
21. Uttra Ashadha
22. Abhijit
23. Sravana
24. Sravishtha or Dhanishta
25. Satabhisaj or Satataraka
26. Purva Bhadrapada
27. Uttra Bhadrapada
28. Revati

(4) For the Sanskrit word *Abhijit*, number 22 in the Table above given, the Prakrit form is *Abhiji*. In the diction of *Guru Granth Sahib*, it is scribed as *Abhichu*. Thus we have the lines :

ਹਰਿ ਆਪਿ ਕਰਤੈ ਪੁਰਬੁ ਕੀਆ ਸਤਿਗੁਰੂ ਕੁਲਖੇਤਿ ਨਾਵਣਿ ਗਇਆ ॥
ਨਾਵਣੁ ਪੁਰਬੁ ਅਭੀਚੁ ਗੁਰ ਸਤਿਗੁਰੁ ਦਰਸੁ ਭਇਆ ॥ ੧ ॥

(ਤੁਖਾਰੀ (ਛੰਤ) ਮਹਲਾ ੪-੧੦, ਸਫ਼ਾ ੧੧੧੬.)

With the aid of *Tika Faridkot* commentary, the meaning of the above scriptural text would be as follows :

> This auspicious day was brought into being by the great Creator Himself. It was then that the *Satguru* had gone to Kurukshetra for bathing. In Kurukshetra on the occasion of *Nakshatra Abhijit* at the auspicious time of bath the congregation drawn from the three worlds had the sight of the revered *Satguru* Amardas.

Thus the scriptural text provides a meaningful astronomical data. The phenomenon of solar eclipse is indicated when the *Guru* was at Kurukshetra [See para 2 above]. The text further furnishes the fact of the dominant position of the *Abhijit Nakshatra* in the sky. These sidereal factors can easily lend themselves to be processed like a chronogram yielding numerical results pin-pointing the precise date of Guru's visit to Kurukshetra. It has already been pointed out that the period of pontificate of the 3rd Guru lay between A.D. 1552-74. During this span of time the phenomenon of solar eclipse occurred as

many as nineteen times as per schedule given below :-

1. January 14, 1553
2. June 18, 1555
3. November 14, 1555
4. May 9, 1556
5. November 2, 1556
6. October 22, 1557
7. April 18, 1558
8. February 26, 1560
9. August 21, 1560
10. February 14, 1561
11. August 10, 1561
12. December 15, 1563
13. June 8, 1564
14. April 9, 1567
15. September 21, 1568
16. February 5, 1570
17. July 21, 1571
18. January 15, 1572
19. July 9, 1572

[*An Indian Ephemeris*, L. D. Swamikannu Pillai, Vol. V, pp. 308-51.]

Further search in the ephemeris reveal the fact that the conjunction of the *Abhijit Nakshatra* in respect of these 19 eclipses occurred twice only. First it was on January 14, 1553 and secondly on January 15, 1572.

We thus see that our quest for the date is narrowed down to the choice between the two dates. The dilema arising out of two conclusive alternatives can however be easily solved. In the same hymn of *Guru Granth Sahib* there is a mention of tax-collectors who were posted to collect the dues from the pilgrims. This was the imposition under the central ruling authority on the Hindu sacred places. The *Guru* however was not called upon to pay the tax. On the other hand, the collectors were over-whelmed by his august personality that they instead made offerings to the *Guru*. As is well known, the pilgrim-tax was remitted by Akbar in A. D. 1563 [*Akbar the Great Mogul*, V. A. Smith, Second edition, 1919, p. 64-65].

This imperial declaration which is a dated incident and by virtue of which the pilgrim-tax is abolished helps to resolve the dilema of the choice between the two alternatives. The date of the visit of Guru Amardas to Kurukshetra is thus pin-pointed to January 14, 1553.

(5) In some books of Astrology there is a mention of 27 *Nakshatras* in place of 28. They omit *Abhijit*. They do not, however, exclude *Abhijit* as such, but consider it as a part of the 22nd *Nakshatra*. Anyway the *Nakshatra* 22nd remains the *Abhijit Nakshatra* in an implicit or explicit form depending on whether the list contains 27 or 28 *Nakshatras*. This only means that the omission in some lists of

Abhijit, is in name only. Its substance remains very much active, living so to speak symbiotically with *Nakshatra* No. 22, but which wakes up to full activity when it has to lend special sanctity to such phenomenon as an eclipse.

It may be noted that out of all *Tirathas*, Kurukshetra is considered the most sacrosoant in respect of celebration in connection with the solar eclipse. In the *Mahabharata* it is said that a bath in the Sannihati *Tirath* (in Kurukshetra) at the time of solar eclipse is productive of the fruits equal in merit to the performance of one thousand *Ashvamedha Yajna* [*Van Parva*, 83, 192, 198-99].

(6) Use of astronomical data in the service of chronology is a recognised methodology in the field of historical dating. The celebrated B. G. Tilak made use of it in his classical work known as *The Orion*, first published in 1893. This was in connection with the antiquities of the *Vedas*. At one place he remarks :

> Astronomically the matter is as simple as it could be. All our measurements of time are directly based upon the changes in the positions of heavenly bodies. But there is no measurement of time, at present determined, which is longer than the period during which the equinoxes complete their revolution in the ecliptic. [*The Orion*, fifth edition, 1972, p. 211.]

I may add that Tilak's imagination took fire when he came across the word *Agrayana* or *Agrahayana* in *Rig Veda*. He exhaustively argued that such a hymn must have been composed when the year began with the sun in the constellation of Orion, i.e., before 4000 B.C. He elaborated his arguments into the shape and dimension of a highly learned thesis of a technical type. The basic assumption in it was the discussion around the vernal equinautical point and its precession during which the equinoxes complete their revolution in the ecliptic. It has now been calculated that the equinoxes complete their cycle, through precession, in about 26,000 years.

This astronomical data provided a rethinking on the age of *Vedas* which so far has been inferred by the western scholars using only the linguistic data. Dr. Bloomfield of John Hopkins University remarked about *The Orion* as :

> "Unquestionably the literary sensation of the year. History, the chronic readjuster, will have her hands uncommonly full to assimilate the results of Tilak's discovery and arrange her paraphernalia in the new perspective."

Census of the Punjab, 1868, and of India, 1871-72

[Extract]

I

Report on the Census of the Punjab taken on 10th January, 1868
[Indian Public Press, Lahore, 1870].

1. The first reliable census of the Punjab was taken on Ist January, 1855. The report on that Census dated Lahore 15th January, 1856, is published in the records of the Government of India, Foreign Department, No. XI of 1856.

2. The next census was intended to be taken in 1864, and preparations for it had made some progress when the undertaking was stopped by the orders of the Governor-General in Council.

3. In 1867, the Punjab Government recommended to the Supreme Government that a census be taken early in 1868. The proposal was sanctioned.

4. The Punjab Government entrusted to the Financial Commissioner of the province the duty of supervising the operations.

117. In the former census the Mahomedans were to the Hindus as 1.37 to 1, or as 100 to 73. They are now as 60 to 40, or as 100 to 66. This would appear to show a decrease among the Hindus, but in the former census Sikhs were not shown separately. The Sikhs are now found to be 6½ per cent. of the total population. Deducting a similar proportion, or say 7 per cent., from the population of the Hindus in the former census, the Mahomedans would then be to the Hindus as 100 to 68. This would still show a slight decrease of Hindus and a corresponding increase of Sikhs. But in the absence of accurate statistics of the number of Sikhs in the former census, no more precise conclusion can be come to.

118. The Sikhs are chiefly found in the Division between the Ravee and the Sutlej as follows :

Umballa	152,263	
Jullundur	197,894	
Umritsur	352,885	
Lahcre	318,666	1,021,708
Other Divisions		122,382
		1,144,090

119. The percentage of Sikhs on total population is highest in the following districts.

Ferozepore	29 percent	Loodiana	16 percent
Umritsur	24 ,,	Jullundur	14 ,,
Lahore	15 ,,		

120. The percentage is lowest on the frontier, being below 1 per cent., except in Kohat where it is 1.26 per cent. It is also low in the Delhi and Hissar Divisions, except in Sirsa where it is at 10 per cent.

135. Agricultural total of all classes 9,683,580 to 7,927,918 non-agricultural or 55 per cent., to 45 per cent.

Proprietors Male :

Sikhs	Hindus	Mahomedans	Others	Total
371,439	1,088743	1,699707	4,568	3164,457
Tenants Male				
83210	602036	1,033297	46854	1765,397
454049	1,690,779	2,733004	51422	4929,854

It is remarkable how greatly the proprietors among the Sikhs outnumber the tenants. Among the Hindus the disproportion is much less, and among the Mahomedan least of all. The proportions may be thus stated :—

Among the Sikhs the number of properietors to tenants is as : 100 to 23; Hindus, 100 to 55; Mohamedans, 100 to 61.

Agricultural Sikhs

The Sikhs when they hold land at all hold it usually as proprietors and seldom as tenants. This is but natural as they were once the masters of the country. The proportion of agricultural Sikhs to non-Agricultural is very much greater than in the other religions. The average for the whole population is 55 per cent. whereas for the Sikhs it is over 71 per cent. The Sikhs do not follow industrial or commercial pursuits to the same extent as is done by Hindus and Mahomedans. In addition to all already specified, a large number of the 56,000 Jagheerdars are Sikhs.* The Sikhs are also found in large numbers in the Army, the Police and the Priestly profession. Of the Sikh proprietors the largest numbers are in the following Districts :—

* Order XVI—Males 30990 Females 25418 Total 56408

Umritsur	90,614	Umballa	16,820
Ferozepore	62,500	Sealkote	15,903
Jullundhar	45,519	Goordaspore	13,617
Lahore	40,109	Goojranwala	13,452
Loodiana	36,459	[Total]	3,57,039
Hoshyarpore	22,046		

These districts make up the four Sikh Divisions of Umballa, Jullundhar, Umritsur and Lahore, with the exception of Simla and Kalka in the latter of which there are only 386 Sikh proprietors. There are only 14,000 Sikh proprietors in all the rest of the Districts put together. In the following Districts there is no one Sikh proprietor.

Goorgaon, Mooltan, Dera Ghazikhan, Peshawur, Kohat, Huzara.

But in Huzara there are apparently 404 Sikh Tenants. Every proprietor in Huzara is entered as a Mahomedan.

Statement showing the number of Proprietors and Tenants on the Districts recently settled :

	Sikhs		Hindus.		Mohamedans		Others	
	P	T	P	T	P	T	P	T
Goojrat	2,022	927	3788	2080	137,298	43849		160
Goojranwala	13452	4267	2277	15177	47,545	23331		1532
Lahore	40109	8690	5498	6304	55,719	47397	361	7826
Umritsur	90614	15192	15225	6982	49,737	25547	242	1892
Sealkote	15903	2988	35626	16243	97,854	60769	46	2026
Goordaspore	13617	4086	46650	26908	50,553	32225	95	2818

Total

Goojrat	143,108	47016	Umritsur	155,818	49617
Goojranwala	63,274	44307	Sealkote	149,429	82026
Lahore	101,687	70217	Goordaspore	110,915	66037

146. A novel feature of this census is that it furnishes statistics of the number of persons who can read and write...The number who can read and write is :

Males	372903
Females	9,962
	382865

or about $2\frac{1}{2}$ persons in every 100. Of females very little of 1 in 1,000 can read and write.

It is strange to find that the largest number of educated females is in Bannoo—1329. Then follow

Goojranwala	1066
Peshawur	956

205. When separated according to religions, the percentage of females varies greatly in different Districts. In the following districts the number of Sikh females to 100 Sikh males is very low :

Kohat	19.36	Dera Ghazikhan	28.16
Goorgaon	23.81	Delhi	33.02

206. In all these Districts the total number of Sikhs is so small that the percentage is of no importance. The few Sikhs who are found there are engaged in service of some kind and do not take their wives and families with them or possibly they are for the most part unmarried.

207. The percentage according to religions should therefore be taken in those districts where the number of persons of the particular religion is large. Viewed in this way, the percentage of Sikh females to Sikh males in the Sikh Districts does not vary greatly.

II

Memorandum on the Census of British India of 1871-72

[London, 1875]

[Extracts]

17. In dealing with the population of the Punjab, it is necessary to take into consideration a third religion, that of the Sikhs, who in this province form an important element, though in the others they are so few as to be merely reckoned among the higher castes of the Hindus. In every 100 persons in the Punjab there are, on an average, 53 Mahomedans, $34\frac{3}{4}$ Hindoos and $6\frac{1}{2}$ Sikhs. ... The stronghold of the Sikhs is the country between the rivers Ravee and Sutlej, including the central districts of Lahore where they form 17, Umritsar where they are 13 per cent. of the people, Umballa where they amount to 9, Jullundur where they are 8 per cent.; in the other districts they range from 3 per cent. to 1 in 300 of the inhabitants.

20. In the portion of the Punjab east of the Indus, Hindee or Punjabee is spoken with varying dialect.

29. Among the Sikhs in the Punjab, however, there are only found $75\frac{3}{4}$ females to 100 males, $51\frac{3}{4}$ children to 100 adults and 78

girls to 100 boys

41. The only difficulty thrown in the way of the officers was in the district of Benares, where some travellers, returning from a pilgrimage, declared that they did not belong to those parts and objected to having their names and ages recorded. There was, however, a general opinion among the lower order that the measure was a preliminery to some new mode of taxation; and in Mynpoory the rumour ran that there was to be a forced conscription to assist in fighting the Afghans and Russians if they invaded the Punjab.

Similar fears prevailed in Oude in 1869, when it was rumoured that one male from each family, or every fourth man, was to be taken as recruit, an emigrant, or a labourer on the roads or to build an enormous fort, or that women were wanted for the European soldiers, while one report was that England had suddenly become so hot that the Queen had desired that two virgins might be sent from each village to fan her night and day, and that the census was a merely a subterfuge for the purpose of carrying out Her Majesty's orders. In particular districts there is little doubt that concealment of girls took place to some extent, through dread of the result of the census.

Table 17. Population of British India according to religion

Sikhs		*Hindus*	*Mohamedans*	*Budhists & Jains*
N.W.P.	1,003			
Oude	4,752			
Punjab	11,44090			
Central Prov.	178			
Berar	406			
Bombay	24,007			
Total	11,74,436	13,92,48,568	4,08,82,537	28,32,851

Christians	Others	Religions not known	Grand Total
8,96,658	51,02,823	4,25,175	19,05,63,048

In the Punjab the Jats are by far the most numerous caste, there being 18,76,000, while no other, except the Brahmins, contains so many as half a million; the Aroras number 1,77,000 and the Khatrees who had a very high social position, 385,000.

Indian Revolutionaries Abroad (1891-1919)*

N. N. BHATTACHARYA

I

Raja Rammohun Roy during his stay in England (1832-33) exchanged his ideas with Robert Owen,[1] the great socialist thinker and a constant friend of the working class, and since then European political ideas began to influence the English-educated Indians, especially the young Bengalis and their successors. But influence, although valuable in itself, was mainly academic in character, having little bearing on revolutionary political activities. In the sphere of practical politics, the Indian intelligentsia of nineteenth century had pinned their faith on the parliamentary principles of liberalism and on the honesty and sense of justice of the British people. Still it is interesting to note that the inauguration of the First International in 1864 was congratulated by a Bengali journal called *Somaprakasa*[2] and that in 1871 the General Council of the First International received a letter from someone of Calcutta asking for powers to start a section of the International in India.[3] This proves that there were at least a few persons in India who were interested in revolutionary activities going on in different parts of the globe. Within a short period of time, however, revolutionary sentiments were spread far and wide in different parts of Asia, Europe and America, and a large number of students, who chose a life of exile, did contribute much to the cause of India's freedom, not only by revealing the ugliness of British rule in India to foreigners hitherto misled by the false propaganda of the British, but also by active participation in revolutionary plans and programmes which were marked by sacrifice and sufferings of all kinds.

II

The earliest revolutionary organisation in the pattern of a secret

---

* *Journal of Indian History*—Silver Jubilee Number—August 1972, pp. 415-30.

1. Collet, S. D., *The life and Letters of Raja Rammohun Roy*, ed. by D. K. Biswas and P. C. Ganguli, pp. 494-95.
2. Chatterjee, G. in *Lenin in Contemporary Indian Press*, p. 100.
3. The *General Council of First International*: 1870-71 Minutes, p. 258; cf. Sehanabis in *Kalantar* (Bengali Weekly), 5-9-1970.

society was the 'Lotus and Dagger'[4] which was set up in England by Arabindo Ghosh in 1891. Nothing precise is known about its function. Charu Chandra Dutt, one of the recruits of Arabindo, said that they came into close touch with the Irish freedom fighters who offered the Indians eight parliamentary seats of their own,[5] provided India should give them funds—a proposal which was, however, rejected by Dadabhai Naoroji who was then a member of the British Parliament and a propagandist of the Indian National Congress.

The credit of establishing in England a more important organisation which in course of time acquired a complete revolutionary character goes to Shyamji Krishnavarma[6] who left India for good in 1897 with the belief that there was no justice in India, which he experienced in the arrest of the Natu brothers and trial of Balgangadhar Tilak. Shyamji established six lecturships of Rs. 1,000 each for Indian students visiting foreign countries and thus gathered round him a group of young men of sacrificing spirit. He did not subscribe to the moderate views of Dadabhai Naoroji and preferred to remain aloof from the London branch of the Indian National Congress. He believed with Herbert Spencer that "resistence to aggression is not simply justifiable but imperative. Non-resistance hurts both altruism and egoism." When the Boer War broke out in 1899, he was displeased with M. K. Gandhi's pro-British role and made a statement of protest. Shyamji was constantly assisted by Sardar Singh Rana,[7] a businessman and a patriot with revolutionary ideas, who was staying at Paris and by Madam Bhikhaji Rustam Cama,[8] 'the Mother of Indian Revolution', who left India for Europe in 1902 and worked in London for some time with Dadabhai Naoroji, but subsequently came in close relation with Shyamji and Sardar Singh Rana. The latter, who left India in 1898, following the instance of Shyamji, offered three travelling fellowships of Rs. 2,000 each to Indian students for the purpose of recruiting revolutionaries, and organised a number of protest-meetings in Paris against British rule.

---

4. Raychaudhuri G. S., *Srī Arabinda O Bāngālāy Swadeshī Yug* (in Bengali), p. 54.
5. Dutt C C., *Purānokathā* (in Bengali), pp. 6-7.
6. For the biography of Shyamji Krishnavarma see Bhattacharya A. C., *Europe Bhāratiya Biplaber Sādhanā* (in Bengali), ch. I; Sarda H. *Shyamji Krishnavarma; Yajnik I L. Shyamji Krishnavarma : Life and Time of an Indian Revolutionary.*
7. Bhattacharya, A. C., *op cit.*, ch. II.
8. *Ibid.*, ch. III; cf. *Essays Presented to Sir Jadunath Sarkar*, pp. 227 ff.

The Indian Home Rule Society was founded by Shyamji and his associates on the 18th February, 1905. The Indian House was also founded for the Indian students which was subsequently manned by such well-known revolutionaries like V. D. Savarkar, Lala Hardayal, Madanlal Dhingra, Birendranath Chattopadhyay, Tirumal Achariya and others. Regarding the general object, both of the Indian Home Rule Society and of its organ, the *Indian Sociologist*, Shyamji wrote : "No systematic attempt has ever been made by the Indians to enlighten the British public with regard to the grievances, demands and aspirations of the people of India. It will be our duty and privilege to plead the cause of India and its unrepresented millions before the bar of the public opinion in Great Britain and Ireland."[9] The *Indian Sociologist* kept a vigilant eye upon the day to day politics of India It expressed its views against the moderate leader Gokhale, supported the candidacy of Tilak for Congress Presidentship and protested against the massacre at Barisal Political conference and the arrest of Surendranath Banerjee which took place in 1906. In the next year (1907), in connexion with the celebration of the anniversary of the Indian revolution of 1857 in the India House, the *Indian Sociologist* published a daring placard, originally issued in April 1859 by Richard Congrave, which was a protest against the thanksgiving ceremony on the victorious conclusion of the war against the Indian sepoys. In the same year, in view of a protest meeting of the Indians against the deportation of Lala Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh which was held in London, it published an exciting appeal of Madam Cama. Hemchandra Kanungo, a revolutionary who was staying in Paris, wrote that the *Indian Sociologist* maintained a close relation with eminent journals like *Gaelic American*, Hyndman's *Justice* and the *Jugāntar* of Bengal[10]

The British press and politicians, getting alarmed at their activities, made attempts to "wash the brains' of the Indian students. In a meeting which the British authorities organised for this purpose under the presidency of Lord Lamington, Sir William Lee-Warner, who was one of the speakers, called Kunjabihari Bhattacharya, an Indian revolutionary, "a dirty nigger", and this remark enraged the audience so much that one of them, Basudeb Bhattacharya struck a blow on the face of Sir William. The target of British press was,

9. Majumdar R. C., *History of the Freedom Movement of India*, II, p. 318.
10. *Bāngālāy Biplab Prachestā* (in Bengali), pp. 178-79.

however, Shyamji whose views were growing more and more revolutionary. Originally he stood for passive resistance but later admitted the necessity of violent activities in response to the situation. Fully conscious of the British conspiracy against him Shyamji thought it wise to leave London and settle in Paris which he did accordingly in 1907. In Paris he joined Sardar Singh Rana and Madam Cama.

During the absence of Shyamji, Vinayak Damodar Savarkar assumed the political leadership of the India House. Savarkar came to England in 1906. In India he had an organisation which was known as *Abhinava Bharat*, a militant organisation having its branches in Maharashtra, Tamilnadu, Mysore and Madhya Pradesh. The proceedings of the Nasik Conspiracy Case show that Savarkar used to send secretly arms to India from the Continent. A member of Savarkar's Indian organisation, P. N. Bapat was sent to Paris to learn the art of bomb-making who worked along with Hem Chandra Das and Mirza Abbas who were also there for the same purpose.[11] Another associate of Shyamji, Lala Hardayal left London in 1907, and after staying for a short time in India, rejoined Shyamji in Paris in 1908. Hardayal had by this time become an extremist and thought it prudent to transfer the centre of his activities to America.[12]

Both Madam Cama and Sardar Singh Rana were elected to represent India at the International Socialist Congress which met at Stuttgart on the 18th of August, 1907. The British labour leader, Ramsay Macdonald, who later became the Prime Minister of England, tried his best to prevent their participation in Congress, but he failed, thanks to the efforts of the German Socialist leaders Bebel, Liebnekhat and Luxemburg and the British labour leader Hyndman who had been always friendly with the Indian revolutionaries. Madam Cama moved there the following resolution: "That the continuance of British rule in India is positively disastrous and extremely injurious to the best interests of India, and lovers of freedom all over the world ought to co-operate in freeing from slavery the fifth of the human race inhabiting that oppressed country, since the perfect social state demands that no people should be subject to any despotic and tyrannical form of government."[13] In support of her resolution Madam Cama made a fiery speech and

11. Majumdar, *op cit.*, II, p. 308.
12. Hardayal, *Fortyfour Months in Germany and Turkey*, p. 29.
13 Bhattacharya A. C., *op. cit.*, pp. 63-64.

waved a tri-coloured Indian National Flag which was probably designed by Hemchandra Kanungo. The resolution, however, was not allowed by Singer, the President, to put to vote on a technical ground.

On July 1, 1909, Curzon Wyllie was shot dead by Madan Lal Dhingra who "attempted to shed English blood as humble revenge for the inhuman hangings and deportations of patriotic Indian youth."[14] A meeting of the Indians condemning the act of Dhingra was held in London under the presidency of Aga Khan where Savarkar made a speech of protest against such condemnation especially when Dhingra's case was sub-judice. Personally Shyamji did not support such feats of individual violence, but Sardar Singh Rana and Madam Cama thought that Dhingra's action was justified. Although Dhingra was sentenced to death, Irish revolutionaries paid glowing tribute to him, and it is interesting to note that Lloyd George and Winston Churchill admired his patriotism.[15] Savarkar was also arrested and sent to India as the principal accused of the Nasik Conspiracy Case. On his way to India Savarkar made a desparate but futile attempt to escape to the French territory. However, with all these events the activities of the India House of Londan practically came to an end. Shyamji continued to edit the *Indian Sociologist* in Paris till the outbreak of the World War in 1914, and then he left Paris for Switzerland where he stayed till his death in 1930. Birendra Nath Chattopadhyay, who was in England since 1903, and Tirumal Achariya left England for Paris to avoid arrest. In 1910 Madam Cama and Chattopadhyay became members of the French Socialist Party. During the World War I Madam Cama was imprisoned in the Vici fort and Sardar Singh Rana was deported to the island of Martinique by the French Government for their pro-German leanings.[16]

---

14. Keer D. *Savarkar and His Times*, p. 55.
15. *Ibid*, pp. 56-57; Blunt W. S., *My Diaries*, II, pp. 276-288.
16. On 12th August 1936 "Madam Cama died unnoticed in Bombay amidst ungrateful surroundings" (Savarkar) In her old age she was probably inclined towards Communism. In an article published in the *Inprecor* of 1st May, 1924 (IV, Pt. XXVII, pp. 263-65), one Rustam Shama is mentioned as 'the famous old revolutionary who is now a communist.' Evidently it refers to Madam Cama, since C in Syriac alphabet pronounces like S. (See Sehanbis in *Kālāntar*, 3-10-1970).

III

In the U. S. A., nationalistic activities were carried on by the Indian working class settled therein who drew their inspiration from Shyamji's *Indian Sociologist* and Madam Cama's *Bandemataram* and *Talwar* which had unrestricted entry into that country. In 1907 the Indian Independence League was established in California by Khagendra Chandra Das, Tarak Nath Das, Adhar Chandra Laskar, Pandurang Khankhoje and a few other Indian students. The League had two branches and 499 members, and its main activities were to preach militant nationalism among the Sikh settlers in America and to send revolutionary leaflets to India. It also had a journal known as *Free Hindustan* which was edited by Tarak Nath Das. Similar organisations very soon developed among the Indian settlers in different parts of America The one of Portland became prominent in 1911-12 under the leadership of Kanshiram Joshi. Such organisations under different groups or individual leaders which sprang up at different times finally culminated into the formation of Ghadar Party in 1913. According to Randhir Singh,[17] the historian of Ghadar movement, two meetings of the Indian workers were held respectively on 13th March and 1st November, 1913, at Astoria, and it was decided to establish the 'Hindi Association of America' and to bring out a weekly paper, *Ghadar*, in different languages. Later on, the name *Ghadar* came to denote the party itself which was formed with Sohan Singh Bhakna as President and Hardayal as Secretary. The Central Office of the party was at 436 Hill Street, San Francisco. In 1918 the party had its own building at 5 Wood Street.[18]

The Ghadar party believed that freedom of India could be achieved only by an armed national revolution, and its main activities, besides the regular campaign of lectures, were the publication of the *Ghadar* in Gurmukhi, Urdu, Hindi and English and various books and pamphlets. In 1914 the New Immigration policy of U.S.A. created a feeling of indignation among the Indians and Hardayal, as the leader of the Ghadar party, not only denounced in strong language the discriminating policy of the American government, but

---

17. Singh R., The *Ghadar Heroes*, pp 8-9.
18. For different views regarding the genesis of the Ghadar party, see Majumdar, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 397 ff; also Datta B. N., *Aprakāśita Rājnaitik Itihās* (in Bengali), pp. 228 ff.

also actively participated in American politics, supporting the cause of the Syndicalist party of America and making public speeches from its platform. Eventually Hardayal had to leave America for Switzerland. During his absence Ram Chandra become the leader of the Ghadar party and invited Bhagwan Singh and Muhammad Barkatullah, who were then in Japan, to come to his aid. They joined him towards the end of May 1914. Barkatullah was a strong advocate of anti-British Pan-Islamism and the editor of a paper called the *Islamic Fraternity*.

IV

With the outbreak of the First World War in 1914, the revolutionary activities of the Indians living abroad assumed a new character. An organisation which later came to be known as the Indian Independence Committee or the Berlin Committee, was set up in Berlin. Indian revolutionaries who were staying in Germany were trying to secure German help for a rising against the British in India, and when the war broke out the Germans also become equally eager to utilise the revolutionary activities of the Indians against the British. There is a good deal of controversy regarding the genesis of the Berlin Committee.[19] According to Bhupendra Nath Datta, who was himself an influential collaborator of the Berlin Committee, a meeting was held between Baron Oppenheim and Birendra Nath Chattopadhyay on September 3, 1914, as a result of which a committee was formally constituted with the name 'The German Union of Friendly India.' Albercht became its President, Oppenheim and Sukhthankar Vice-Presidents, and Dhiren Sarkar, the Secretary. After some time Sukhthankar was replaced by Chattopadhyay and Dhiren by Dr Mueller. There were 17 other Indian members in the Committee. By the middle of 1915 the German Union of Friendly India was renamed as Indian Independence Committe and its constitution was throughly changed. Its office was filled up solely by the Indians.[20] But according to another account, which Dr Majumdar quotes from the work of Landau, it was Hardayal who organised the Indian Independence Committee with the help of Von Wesendonck who was the secretary in charge of the Indian section of the German Foreign Office.[21] Likewise Chem-

19. Majumdar, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 404 ff.
20. Datta B.N., *op. cit.*, chs , I-III.
21. Landau H., The *Enemy Within*, p. 29.

pakaraman Pillai of Kerala, who left India in 1908, is credited with playing in important role. Before the outbreak of the war he set up at Zurich an association, called the International Pro-Indian Committee, and started a journal called *Pro-India* and it is said that he came in agreement with Chattopadhyay, Abdul Hafiz, Dr Prabhakar, Bhupendra Nath Dutta and Barkatullah which marked the inception of the Indian Independence Committee. It therefore appears that like the Ghadar party of America, different streams headed by individual leaders coalesced into a single organisation, the Berlin Committee, and the process was quickened by the German Official enthusiasm.

V

The Berlin Committee established contact with the Indian revolutionaries in U.S.A. through German Embassy in that country and it was decided that the Ghadar party would carry on revolutionary work in accordance with the direction of Berlin Committee. We have a fairly authentic account of the Indo-German activities in U.S.A.[22] Ram Chandra of the Ghadar party was entrusted with the task of sending men and arms to India. He was receiving monthly a thousand dollars from the German Consulate. Although he was able to send some men through the Chinese ports, Shanghai and Swato, little progress was made in securing arms. It is said that Franz Von Papen of the German embassy in U.S.A. manged to get arms and ammunition in considerable quantity which were sent to San Diego, California, in January 1915. It was planned that these would be carried by the Schooner, *Annie Larsen*, and then transferred to the tanker *Maverick*. With the arms *Annie Larsen* arrived at the meeting place, but there was no trace of *Maverick*, and thus the whole scheme fell through.[23]

Heramba Gupta, who was working in the U.S A. on behalf of the Berlin Committee, was replaced by Chandra Chakravarty in February 1916 by orders of the German authorities. The latter, as an organiser of the Pan-Asiatic League, tried to enlist support of China and Japan. It was proposed that China and Japan, by forming an alliance with Germany, would help the Indian revolutionaries by sending force and arms to them across the border. But no positive response came from China and Japan. Sun Yat-sen, who was a source of inspiration to the

22. The following account is based upon Majumdar, *op cit.*, II, pp. 414; cf. Brown G.T. 'The Hindu Conspiracy 1914-17' in *Pacific Historical Review*, XVII, pp. 289-310.

23. See Sec. VIII.

Indian revolutionaries. unexpectedly disappointed them. The net result was shocking. Men sent to India through the Chinese ports by Ram Chandra of the Ghadar Party were arrested.[24] Arms could not be secured. In one report Chakravarty admitted that in a period of six months no more than two hundred pistols could be sent. It is indeed surprising why the Germans themselves did not supply arms and why Gupta and Chakravarty had to negotiate with China and Japan for the same purpose.

However, Chakravarty was arrested in U.S.A. on 6th March, 1917. Soon after his arrest he disclosed the identity of his associates, as a result of which, on April 7, 1917, Ram Chandra and sixteen other Indian were arrested in San Francisco. The famous San Francisco trial opened on November 20, 1917, in which 105 persons were accused as conspirators. On the last day of the trial Ram Chandra was shot dead in the court by one of his comrades, Ram Singh, who in turn was also killed by a Marshall. The judgement was delivered on April 23, 1918, of the original 105 accused, 29 were convicted. Thus ended the Indo-German conspiracy in the U.S.A.

VI

It appears that all the attempts to despatch arms to India failed owing to the reluctance of the Germans to take this business seriously. M.N. Roy said in his *Memoirs* that on the suggestion of Helfferich a plan was made to storm the Andmans by the German ships staying in the Dutch harbours. but if failed because the Germans refused to play such a serious game. The German Consul-General disappeared mysteriously on the way when he was expected to issue orders for the execution of the plan. Later on, a proposal was given to the Germans that if they gave India money she might herself purchase arms from different countries. This proposal was sent to the German Embassy in the U.S.A. and in reply M.N. Roy was asked to go to China and meet there the German Ambassador Admiral Hintze. Roy thereupon left Java and went to the Philippines, Japan and Korea *en route* to China. In Japan Rash Behari Bose asked him to wait and told him that the liberation of India was conditional upon the success of the bigger mission of Japan, namely, to free Asia from white domination. He met Sun Yatsen who told him that if sufficient amount of money could be raised, there would be no difficulty in collecting necessary arms

24. *Sedition Committee Report*, p. 149.

and ammunition and handing them over to India at any place on the frontier. With his proposal Roy met Admiral Hintze and had long talks with him. The Admiral showed great interest in the said proposal and an agreement was made at Hankow, but all of a sudden, when the plan was finalised, the German Ambassador began to speak in a different language. Recalling this, Roy wrote : "The conversation with von Hintze dispelled my still lingering illusion about Germany's sympathy for the victims of British Imperialism."[25]

VII

Indian revolutionaries also went to various countries of South East Asia, and men like Kshirod Gopal Mukherjee, Bhola Nath Chatterjee and others had already set up revolutionary organisations in those countries. Originally it was decided that Germans in Siam would attack Burma and that three ships, full of arms, would be sent to India. The invasion of Burma would be followed by revolutionary outbreaks in different parts of India under the leadership of Rashbihari Bose, Sachindra Sanyal and Jatindra Nath Mukherjee. The outbreak in India was to be held on 15th February, 1915, but the plan was disclosed by Kripal Singh, a police-informer, who managed to get himself acquainted with the revolutionaries. Rashbihari thereupon fled to Japan. On the same day the Fifth Light Infantry at Alexandria Barracks of Singapore rose to a mutiny, which was, however, crushed very soon.[26]

In March 1915, Atmaram of the Ghadar Party met Jadugopal Mukherjee in Calcutta and assured him of arms coming through the German Consul-General of Bangkok. This was the plan referred to in the preceding section in connexion with the *Memoirs* of M.N. Roy. It was decided that three ships would be used for this purpose : the first was to go to Hatia, the second to Balasore, while the third to the Andamans for conquering the islands and releasing the political prisoners staying therein. It was also decided that from the Andamans the Germans along with the Indians would attack Rangoon and Singapore. But the scheme was disclosed as a result of which Phani Chakrabarty was arrested at Shangai and Abani Mukherjee at Singapore. From Abani's notebook a few names of Indian revolutionaries were found and they were also arrested. Of them Amar Singh of

25. Bhattacharjee G. P., *Evolution of Political Philosophy of M. N. Roy*, pp. 19-20.
26. MacMunn G. The *Turmoil and Tragedy in India, 1914 and after*, pp. 106-13.

Packo was later sentenced to death.[27]

In May 1915, the Berlin Committee sent Vincent Kraft to Batavia with a similar programme of invading the Andamans, but nothing came out of this plan. Kraft was arrested at Singapore. In July 1915, the Berlin committee sent Dr. Daus Dekkar, but he was arrested in China. According to the British official version, "Gupta returned to San Francisco from Berlin to organise the Siam expedition by which depots were to be established on the Siamese frontiers of Burma where Indian revolutionaries could be trained by German officers, equipped with arms, and launched against Burma. There Ramchand sent many of the Ghadar Party, while the Sikh, Bhagwan Singh was despatched to Japan, China and Manila to collect recruits from among the Indians serving there. But most of these were arrested at Bangkok in August 1915, shortly after their arrival there."[28]

VIII

Now we shall give a brief note on the Indian consequences of the activities of the Berlin Committee and the Ghadar Party. As soon as the Indian revolutionaries came to know of the arrangements being made by Germany for sending arms, the plan for a general rising took difinite shape under the leadership of Rashbihari Bose, Sachindra Sanyal, Vinayak Rao Kaple, Damodar Swarup, Pratap Singh, Avadh Bihari, Balmukund, Bachcha Singh, Kartar Singh, Vishnu Ganesh Pingley, Jatindra Nath Mukherjee, Nalini Mukherjee, and others. It was decided that on February 21, 1915, the sepoys in the contonments all over North India would suddenly attack the English soldiers, and thus begin a countrywide revolution. As we have been above[29] the plan was disclosed by Kirpal Singh and the whole plot miscarried. One of the plotters, Pingley made another desparate attempt, but he was arrested and tried along with his followers in the Lahore Conspiracy Case.[30]

On behalf of the Bengal group, headed by Jatindra Nath Mukherjee, Naren Bhattacharya (who later became famous as M. N. Roy), adopting the pseudonym Martin, went to Batavia and making arrangements to receive the cargo of the *Maverick*, which was said to

27. Bhattacharya N. N., *Bhārater Svādhinatā Sangrāmer Itihās*, pp. 113 ff.
28. MacMunn, *op. cit.*, p. 121.
29. Sec. VII.
30. *Sedition Committee Report*, p. 157.

consist of 30,000 rifles with 400 rounds of ammunition each and 2 lakhs of rupees, wired to Harry and Sons, a bogus business concern managed by Hari Kumar Chakrabarti, a well known revolutionary, that the 'business was hopeful.' The task of taking delivery of the cargo of the *Maverick* was entrusted upon Jadugopal Mukherjee. He communicated with a zamindar in the vicinity of Rai Mangal who had promised to provide all sorts of help. It was hoped that the ship would arrive by 1st of July, 1915. Some men under Atul Ghosh kept constant watch from boats. But the *Maverick* did not arrive. On 3rd July, 1915, the revolutionaries received a message that the German Consul in Siam was sending by boat a consignment of 5,000 rifles and ammunition to Rai Mangal. But this also did not arrive.[31] On 7th August, 1915, the police searched the premises of Harry and Sons and arrested some revolutionaries. Then they turned their attention to Balasore where the leader Jatindra Nath Mukherjee and his associates were staying with the hope of receiving arms. After a heroic fight with the police, Jatindra and his associates were killed.

IX

Turkey's entry into the war against Britain created a strong anti-British feeling in the Muslim states, and attempt was made by the Indian revolutionaries living abroad, and especially the Berlin Committee, to utilise this feeling in their favour. Chempakaramen Pillai, of whom we had already occasion to refer, made an attempt to induce the Indian prisoners of war to join the Indian National Volunteer Corps, organised by him, and chose Mesopotamia as the centre for his Corps to wage war against the English.[32] At the beginning of 1915, Barkatullah, Kersamp and Tarak Nath Das went to Istambul where they were received by Enver Pasha and were assured by the Turkish Government of help in task of formulating a plan of enlisting the Indian war prisoners into a revolutionary army. But this plan could not be worked with success on account of the communal spirit between the Hindu and Muslim soldiers resulting from the partiality shown to the latter by the Turks. A revolutionary committee was also set up in Iran with headquarters in Berlin. Attempts were also made to combine the Muslim states against the

31. *Ibid*, pp. 121-22.
32. Majumdar, *op. cit.*, II, p. 412.

British, and Obeidullah carried on negotiations for this purpose with various Arab states. He maintained close contact with the *Mujahidin* of North Western India,[33] a Pan-Islamic group determined to destroy the British rule and create a Muslim India, and left secretly for Kabul where he met other revolutionaries from India and got himself specially acquainted with Raja Mahendra Pratap who came to Afghanistan. along with Von Henting and Barkatullah, as the head of an Indo-German Mission. Mahendra Pratap, who was especially honoured by the Kaiser himself, carried with him 26 letters from Bethmann Hollweg, the German Chancellor, addressed to Indian Princes requesting them to rise against the British and assuring them of the German support. The Mission on its way visited the Turkish Sultan at Istambul who gave him a letter for the Amir of Afghanistan. His associate Barkatullah procured a *futwa* from Sheikh-ul-Islam asking the Muslims of India to act in union with the Hindus. On its way to Persia Mahendra Pratap's Mission met another Mission led by Niedermayer On 2 October, 1915, the Mission reached Kabul and was received by King Habibullah. A Provisional Government of India was set up in Kabul on 1st December, 1915, with Mahendra Pratap as its President and Barkatullah and Obeidullah as the Prime Minister and Home Minister respectively. This Provisional Government sent several missions to the Indians princes and tried to come to some kind of understanding with Russia.[34]

Shortly after Obeidullah left for Kabul, his followers Mahmud Hassan and Mian Ansari, met Ghalib Pasha, then Turkish Military Governor of Hedjaz and obtained from him a declaration of *Jihad* (holy war) against the British and distributed its copies to the frontier tribes of India. A scheme of a Pan-Islamic army, to be formed under the active guidance of Turkish Government and the Sheriff of Mecca, with its headquarters at Medina and subordinate commands at Constantinople, Teheran and Kabul was chalked by Obeidullah who wrote a series of letters to different influential persons of the Muslim world. These letters were dated 9th July, 1916, written on yellow silk and sewn up inside the lining of the coat of a special messenger who was to convey them in person to Mahmud Hasan for sending to proper places. But this 'silk letter conspiracy' was disclosed, and no positive result came out of it.[35]

33. *Sedition Committee Report*, pp. 174-75.
34. See Mahendra Pratap's *My Life Story of Fifty Five Years.*
35. O' Dwyer M. F., *India as I knew it*, pp. 180-81.

X

The famous San Francisco trial, mentioned above, marked the end of the Indo-German revolutionary activities in the U. S. A. Chandra Chakravarty and Se Kunna were arrested on 6th March, 1917, and this was followed by the arrests of Heramba Gupta, Agnes Smedley, Sailendra Nath Ghosh, Pulin Bihari Bose, Tarak Nath Das, Bhai Bhagwan [Singh], Dhiren Sarkar and others. The German agents—Frank Bopp, Von Schack, Wilhelm Von Brinchen, etc.—were also convicted in a supplementary trial. The Indo-German conspiracy thus disclosed; there was no scope for reviving the revolutionary activities once again in the U.S.A. A feeling of frustration pervaded among the revolutionaries of the Berlin Committee. The end of war could be seen, and Germany was inevitably running towards defeat and disaster. After 1917 the Committee devoted its energy mainly to the propaganda war giving up all hopes of a rebellion in India. In the International Socialist Conference held at Stockholm in 1917, the Berlin Committee took chance of raising the question of India independence. It sent a telegram to Trotsky at Brest Lito-vsk requesting him to uphold the cause of India and also sent one to Philip Snowden for the same purpose.

With the end of the First World War and the complete defeat of the Axis Powers, Germany ceased to be the theatre of the revolutionary activities of the Indians. They now became interested in the Soviet Union. The success of the socialist revolution in Russia, and the prospect of Soviet help to the Indian struggle for freedom inspired them evidently. The first to realise the great significance of the Russian revolution, with a thorough training in Marxian ideas, was M. N. Roy who had escaped to Mexico during the San Francisco trial and managed to become a prominent figure in the left-wing politics of that country. He was selected to head a delegation to the Second World Congress of the Communist International and in November 1919 he started for Moscow with a Mexican diplomatic passport. His training of Marxism was very helpful in securing a good ground there, and eventually he could become a favourite of Lenin who made him a member of the Presidium of the Communist International and the Head of its Eastern Department.

Roy was not, however, the first Indian revolutionary to go to the Soviet Union or to meet Lenin. In May 1919, Raja Mahendra Pratap along with Tirumal Achariya and Abdur Rab Peshwari, met Lenin

in Moscow, and in June Rahamat Karim Elahi Zhacharia had the occasion to address the Third Congress of the Turkistan communist Party. Obeidulla, who was a minister of the Provisional Government of India in Kabul, went to Russia in October 1919 to see the consequences of the revolution and to draw the attention of the Soviet Government to the cause of the Indian freedom movement. Barkatullah went as the personal embassador of King Amanulla of Afghanistan and in one of his lectures in the Soviet Union, he invited Communist help to crush the British power in India which, according to him, was the biggest representative of Asian capitalism. Dalip Singh Gill, another Indian revolutionary, also met Lenin for securing Russian help in the Indian freedom movement. But Roy was especially selected by the Soviet authorities for reasons we have stated above.

During the Khilafat movement in India, a number of Pan-Islamic workers, known as *Muhajirs*, left India for Turkey and a few of them could reach Tashkent in September 1920. M. N. Roy, on behalf of the Communist International, made contact with them and was able to convert some of these fanatic Pan-Islamists into confirmed communists. In 1921, the Berlin Committee group consisting of Birendra Nath Chattopadhyay, Bhupindra Nath Datta, Birendra Nath Dasgupta, Abdul Wahed, Pandurang Khankhoje, Gholam Ambia Khan Lohani, Heramba Gupta, Nalini Gupta, and Agnes Smedley also went to Moscow. Thus after the fall of Berlin, Moscow became the seat of Indian revolutionaries. How far this new atmosphere could speed up the Indian freedom movement, we propose to demonstrate in a subsequent article.

The Muhammadan Educational Conference and the Aligarh Movement 1886-1900

EDWARD D CHURCHILL, JR *

The Muhammadan Educational Conference[1] (hereafter, MEC or Conference) was founded by Saiyad Ahmad Khan in 1886 as a forum for the discussion of educational issues and for the presentation of Sir Saiyad's ideas and sense of priorities on educational matters. Sir Saiyad hoped to gain support, financial and otherwise, from the elite of the Muslim community for his approach to education and for the Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental College at Aligarh (hereafter, MAO College). The founding of the Conference also coincided with Sir Saiyad's public warnings in Lucknow (1887) and Meerut (1888) about Muslims attending the Indian National Congress. The Conference was clearly meant to divert Muslims away from the activities of the Congress and toward those issues and problems which Sir Saiyad regarded as being vital to the interests of the community. To this end the Annual Meeting was scheduled to coincide with that of the Indian National Congress in hopes of drawing Muslims away from it. Aside from its role as a substitute for the Indian National Congress, however, the Conference did address itself to educational matters.[2] It was not a political conference in disguise. Rather, it reflected Sir Saiyad's conviction that certain kinds of educational reforms were essential to the welfare of the community, far more essential than opposition politics. The aim of this article is to assess

---

* University of Pennsylvania.

1. The original name was The Muhammadan Educational Congress. This was changed to the Muhammadan Educational Conference at the Fifth Conference to differentiate it from the Indian National Congress. The name was changed still again at the Tenth Conference to Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental Educational Conference. I have used the Muhammadan Educational Conference throughout this paper.

2. More needs to be done on the political role of the Conference. The Conference proceedings do not give the impression that the question of a choice between the MEC and INC was important to many Muslims. Some Muslims like Munshi Muharram Ali Chishti and Maulvi Muhammad Fazl-ud-Din belonged to both.

the Conference as an educational forum between 1886 and 1898, the years of Sir Saiyad's domination over it. What kind of a forum did it represent ? What were its accomplishments planned or otherwise ? To what extent did it fulfill Sir Saiyad's educational objectives ?

The Conference and the Aligarh Movement

The very idea of convening an educational conference which prohibited resolutions and discussion on political and religious matters reflected the Aligarh approach of removing education from opposition politics and from the complete domination of religion. Such a conference did suit Sir Saiyad's personal political convictions and removed from discussion his controversial religious ideas. It also helps explain why the Conference became in so many ways an extension of the Aligarh Movement despite numerous efforts to the contrary.

The locations of the Annual Meetings and the membership of the Conference are cases in point. In the first 12 years of the Conference 1886-1898, the membership and location of the annual meeting was largely confined to North India, Punjab, NWP and Oudh. This was the same constituency as that of the MAO College. The Conference was convened five times at Aligarh and met only three times outside the NWP-Oudh, once in Delhi and twice in Lahore (see Table I). Similarly dues paying members were divided equally between NWP-Oudh and the Punjab with the Princely States in the North and Hyderabad running third and fourth (see Table II). The healthy representation of the Punjab can be attributed in part to the vigorous work of the *Anjuman Islamia*, a supporter of Sir Saiyad's educational ideas, and to a lesser extent the *Anjuman Himayat-i-Islam.* In 1890, for example, when the Conference was convened at Aligarh, the Anjuman recruited 103 members from the district of Amritsar which was more than the entire North West Provinces for that year.

The efforts to expand the Conference, however, should not be overlooked;[3] the Conference was regional less by design than through force of circumstances and lack of support outside North India. The sixth and tenth Conferences were supposed to be convened in Patna and Bombay but were cancelled at the last moment. There was extensive correspondence with Muslims in Bombay and Patna to try and persuade them to support the Conference[4] and in 1896, Mohsin-ul-

3. See comments on the chart at the conclusion of the article.
4. *Report of the Seventeenth Muhammadan Anglo-Oriental Education Conference*, p. 1. (Hereafter an abbreviated form of the title will be cited.)

Mulk travelled to Poona and Bombay on a tour in an effort to try and establish local committees. Sir Saiyad had reasons to fear that the aims of the Conference might be diverted or subverted if it were held outside the North. He would have preferred that Muslims from Bombay, Madras and Calcutta make the trip to Aligarh rather than taking the annual session to them but apparently this was a risk he was willing to take.

Actually there were practical and motivational problems to getting the Conference convened anywhere outside Aligarh. Invitations to the annual session were supposed to come from a committee of local citizens. These were usually issued only after considerable prompting from Aligarh. In addition, it was difficult to get the local committee to advertise the Conference through newspapers, posters and letters.

The Conference attracted many respectable members of the community, the elite and many in Government service but according to frequent comments in the annual sessions the wealthy members of the community, or at least those who had not committed themselves to supporting MAO College, were not attending. Nor did many of the well known orthodox *Ulama* attend. As we shall see however this did not preclude strong opposition to some of Sir Saiyad's educational ideas at the annual meetings. Evidently not all members of the Conference came from the Aligarh constituency.

The affairs and interests of the Aligarh Movement intruded on the Conference in other ways as well. The MAO College was repeatedly referred to as an example of what could be accomplished. The students were held up as models of the right combination of worldly sophistication and communal sympathy and were granted honorary visiting status whenever the Conference was convened at Aligarh, the only group to be so privileged. The annual session was also used several times by Sir Saiyad as a constituency for the problems he was having with various factions at the College.[5] Numerous other examples could be given.

Educational Issues

Despite the fact that the Conference was the product of the Aligarh Movement and was attended largely by Aligarh supporters, it functioned as an open forum on educational matters. Encouragement was given to the discussion of just about any subject relating to

5. *Report of the Fourth Conference*, Resolution Eight, p. 141.

education and this was reflected in the broad objectives formulated in the first Conference.

Goals of the Muhammadan Educational Conference[6]

1. That European Science and Literature should spread among the Muslims and that ways should be found to promote this.

2. In private English schools managed by Muslims, inquiry should be made about the state of religious education and efforts made to improve the quality of education.

3. Eastern learning and theology taught in traditional ways by the *ulama* should be available to those who want it. Ways should be found to implement this.

4. The *maktab*, the private elementary level school should be improved and extended for the education of the common people.

5. Schools for memorizing the Quran should be improved and extended. Sir Saiyad was mindful of the role he played as the dominating presence at these Conferences. He praised all those who spoke out against his ideas and spoke in favour of resolutions which he would not have supported under different circumstances. In the first Conference, for example, he supported a resolution on the importance of maintaining the traditional Persian *maktab*. In the Second, Eighth and Tenth Conferences, he took a vigorous stand against them.[7]

The variety of subjects of the various resolutions, 124 in the first fourteen Conferences, testify to the diversity of interests expressed.

Subjects of the Resolutions Passed at the Conferences 1886-1900

Runing of the Annual Conference	9

6. These are the five goals of the First Conference. Other goals were added as resolutions incorporated new areas of activity. The *Report of the Tenth Conference* lists eleven goals. In addition to the original five:

   6. To carry on research on Muslim accomplishments.
   7. To compile biographies of Muslim scholars and authors.
   8. To procure and trace the rare writings of the Muslims.
   9. To carry on research and to create interest in historic accounts of the past.
   10. To collect Firmans in order to preserve them.
   11. To organize lectures and research on worldly knowledge *(Dunyavi)*.

7. *Report of the First Conference*, p. 41.
   Report of the Second Conference, p. 120.
   Report of the Eighth Conference, Supplement No. 1, pp. 16-17.

Implementing resolutions	22
Muslim curriculum needs	29
In Government schools	15
Crafts	2
Quran	2
Arabic	1
Legal	1
Yunani Medicine	1
Western Medicine	1
Engineering	2
General	4
Thanks for money, scholarships and services	9
Rewriting history, textbooks, translations, collecting MSS, improving Muslim scholarship	9
Establishing a Muslim University	6
Restoring private (indigenous) primary schools	6
Raising money, scholarship, avoiding payment of fees	6
Restoring *auqaf* and *zakat*	5
Social reform related to education	5
Women's education	5
Improving and retaining Urdu	2
Support of Nadwat-ul-Ulama	2
Affairs of MAO College	2
Miscellaneous	7

It is worth noting that all but six resolutions were passed unanimously and of 124 resolutions only one was rejected.[8] This was due to confusion about its meaning. Later it was incorporated in another resolution and passed. Opposition was expressed through carefully worded counter resolutions and in speeches given in their support.

The effort to establish an open conference to which all Muslims could subscribe despite their differences was supplemented and aided by the evident interest and eagerness of the members to promote and reaffirm their identity as Muslims. Both Beck and Sir Saiyad regarded this as one of the essential functions of the Conference. The Conference did not create this feeling or need but did provide the opportunity for its expression. The term *qaum* (community) received special currency as did the phrases *quami hamdardi*

8. Third resolution of the Second Conference.

(Communal sympathy), *qaumi usul* (principles of the community), *qaumi mela* (for the conference) and *qaumi bait ul muqadas* (for Aligarh). *Qaum* referred to all Muslims of India. It was never used in the sense of all Indians as Sir Saiyad had used it in the past, nor to indicate a nation. This spirit was further fostered by poems, lectures on Islamic history and many non-controversial resolutions.

Broad cultural sympathies however could not hide very different orientations and understandings about the nature of the *qaum*, its relationship to Islamic history and its future needs. At the risk of over simplification, two broad orientations or sets of attitudes can be discerned among those who participated in the proceedings. One was forward looking, activist, selective and anxious to adapt the community to present circumstances, represented by Sir Saiyad, Theodore Beck, Mohsin-ul-Mulk, Saiyad Mahmud and others of the Aligarh Movement. The other was backward looking, nostalgic, uncritical and anxious to preserve traditional ways and values. The second group had no major spokesmen but can be seen in the speeches of twenty-five or thirty individuals.[9]

Islamic history for the first group contained specific lessons on how a community can improve itself as, for example, acquiring useful knowledge through foreign languages as the Arabs had done.[10] The second group regarded the Islamic community of the Golden period of Islam, or what they understood it to be, as a guide to what should be restored.[11] The first group wanted facts and statistics about the backward state of the community so that they could use the communities meagre resources in the most strategic ways. The second group evinced little interest in ways and means and would not or could not focus on the degree to which the community was backward. A reaffirmation of traditional institutions and ways of thinking seemed to be sufficient. The first group used Western society as the model or guide of what should be done. They argued for close association, even dependence on the West. The second group rejected much of what they saw in Western society and wanted to

9. The most persistent speakers were :
Irfan Ali Beg, Munshi Muhammadan Sajjad Husain, Munshi Ahmad Ali Shauq, Munshi Siraj-ud-Din.

10. *Report of the Eighth Conference*, supplement No. 1, p. 74. This observation was made many times.

11. See, for example, the speech of Sheikh Khair-ud-Din in *Report of the Third Conference*, pp. 112-17.

avoid dependence and an intimate association with it. Members of the second group were in disagreement however about which values and customs should be preserved and why. They seemed to be caught between the religious arguments of the *ulama* and the strong modernist position of Sir Saiyad. They lacked the religious learning of the former and the conviction of the latter. They had more pride than the members of the Aligarh Movement in the strength and resourcefulness of the 19th century Muslim community.

Even the bases of self-criticism, of which there was a great deal, were different. When nothing was done to implement the resolutions, Sir Saiyad became pessimistic and, in his later years, proclaimed several times that the community was dead.[12] The second group focussed on the quality of life and criticized the inability to live up to cultural and historic ideals. While these orientations are broad and incomplete, they do help us understand the dialogue on educational issues.

Most of the subjects contained in the 124 resolutions were non-controversial or involved disagreement over tactics and minor points. Two issues however which brought these different mind sets into direct opposition were (1) whether advanced or college level education should be given priority over middle and lower level education, and (2) whether the Persian *maktab* should continue to be established despite its quality. Each question was considered separately but together they represented two sides of a coin. To members of the Aligarh Movement, both matters involved crucial priorities and the use of valuable resources. Sir Saiyad at one point claimed that the very fate of the community depended on channeling all available funds to high level education and, in particular, to completing MAO College.[13] Persian *maktabs*, he argued, were emerging like a bad rash or a disease and should not be encouraged unless their quality could be guaranteed. He was not against the *maktab*, he explained on another occasion, it was a question of priorities when the community had little time or money to waste. If Primary schools had to be started, they should teach English, have European masters and work with a budget of at least 2,500 Rupees.[14]

Opponents to this view, like Irfan Ali Beg and Ahmad Ali

12. *Report of the Tenth Conference*, secretaries report, pp. 35-44.
13. *Report of the Eighth Conference*, resolution five, pp. 1-62.
14. *Report of the Second Conference*, resolution three, p. 73.

Shauq, regarded the *maktab* as custodian of a way of life. They assumed that Sir Saiyad wanted to eliminate most of the Quran schools as well, an assumption that was not altogether valid, and claimed that knowledge of the Quran and religious customs was also at stake. They believed that the revival and regeneration of the community depended on the proliferation of these schools. Like Sir Saiyad they accepted the notion that the sons of the nobility *(ashrāf)* were better qualified for higher education but they also argued that other Muslims should spend a few years in a *maktab* to learn to read and write and to be exposed to Muslim cultural and religious values and customs. Moreover they believed the *maktab* was better suited to accomplish these ends than the government and missionary primary schools.[15]

Other differences on educational questions which cut across the two broad orientations did not seem to involve the same depth of feeling or conviction. Among these were the questions of the value of learning Persian and Arabic,[16] the education of women,[17] and whether the community should expect preferential treatment from the government.[18] On the questions surrounding the education of women i.e., whether the education of women was essential to the progress of the community, whether they should receive education now or after men, and whether they should study the same subjects as men, Sir Saiyad found himself at odds with many in the Aligarh Movement.

Up to 1900, none of these issues was ever resolved. Nor, as we shall see was much done to implement the resolutions. Perhaps a few minds were changed one way or the other but by and large the Conference did not succeed in establishing a consensus on educational priorities. Instead, it seemed to crystallise and accentuate the differences. Sir Saiyad and others appeared to have set themselves to an impossible task, that of trying to rally support for views which the community was not ready to support.

Implementing Resolutions and other Activities

The activities of the Conference in areas other than discussing

15. *Report of the Second Conference*, resolution seven, pp. 140-48.
16. *Report of the Fifth Conference*, resolution three, p. 158.
17. *Report of the Sixth Conference*, resolution six, p. 145.
Report of the Third Conference, resolution seventeen, p. 110.
18. *Report of the Third Conference*, resolution six, p. 77.

resolutions and reciting poetry reveal a somewhat similar pattern. Leadership and responsibility for these activities was assumed or had to be assumed by leaders of the Aligarh Movement. Most activities were sanctioned by a resolution which implied interest and financial support on the part of the members of the Conference but it was clear that nothing would be done unless the Aligarh spokesmen took the initiative. Activities centered either on extending the organization and responsibility of the Conference or on collecting information about the state of Muslim education in North India. They can be grouped under one of six headings ; (1) efforts to establish local committees throughout North India, (2) gathering information about Muslim Education, (3) publicising the goals and activities of the Conference, (4) running a survey or census of good Muslim families to determine why they did not send their children to school, (5) establishing a department for schools affiliated with MAO College and (6) lectures at the annual meetings. A brief description of each will indicate the nature of the activities.

(1) An attempt was made to establish committees throughout North India to increase membership, to send delegates to the annual meeting, to collect money for scholarships for local students ; in short, they were to be branch offices of the Conference. Where possible these committees were to be formed out of the branch organizations of the *Anjuman Islamia* or other majlises and anjumans, if they were willing and would subscribe to the views of the Conference. A list of Muslim anjumans in India was compiled and presented to the Fourth Conference to aid in this effort.[19] A resolution was passed in the First Conference to establish committees in cities and towns.[20] This was followed by a resolution in the Third Conference to establish District and Provincial Standing Committees and a Central Standing Committee at Aligarh.[21]

The result of these efforts was poor with notable exceptions. The resolution calling for the establishment of District and Provincial committees was reintroduced three times as a reminder that little had been done.[22] It was further suggested in subsequent resolutions

19. *Report of the Fourth Conference*, pp. 56-68.
20. *Report of the First Conference*, rules and aims of the conference, rule No. 8.
21. *Report of the Third Conference*, resolution three, p. 66.
22. *Report of the Eleventh Conference*, resolution three, p. 112.
Report of the Tenth Conference, resolution ten, p. 326.
Report of the Thirteenth Conference, resolution twenty, p. 160.

that a travelling orater be sent throughout North India to assist in setting up local committees and to help in spreading the aims of the Conference,[23] that anjumans be further pressed to cooperate,[24] that a magazine be established to coordinate the activities of the local committees,[25] and that the *Anjuman Islamia* establish branches in towns which had not sent delegates to the Conference.[26] None of these resolutions was ever implemented. Another effort was made by Beck who tried to convene a meeting in February 1890 of representatives from different districts in order to establish standing committees. Only five districts sent delegates.[27] The only positive response in a rather bleak picture were the activities of the *Akhwan us Sufa* of Kanpur[28] and the *Anjuman Islamia* of Lahore, Amritsar and Jullundur.

(2) The first effort at gathering information about the state of education among the Muslims was made at the First Conference. It was written into the rules that a report on the number of Muslims in 15 types of schools should be delivered every five years for every district.[29] It was hoped that this would enable Muslims to note the direction of change. A long report was delivered on Jubbulpore at the First Conference which was intended to act as a model for the others. A total of 37 reports, 31 reports on 28 districts and 6 reports on individual Muslim schools, were made in the first years.[30] They range considerably in length and quality ; some drew their information from the annual reports of the Director of Public Instruction. A committee was established at the Seventh Conference to supervise the reports. The committee appointed a person from each district to be responsible for the reports. No further action was taken and no more reports were delivered.

(3) Beck was responsible for founding the Educational Census. The purpose of the Census was to gather information on the children of respectable families who were not attending school. The census

23. *Report of the Fourth Conference*, resolution six, p. 131.
24. *Report of the Fourth Conference*, resolution two, p. 112.
25. *Report of the Sixth Conference*, resolution three, p. 115.
26. *Report of the Eighth Conference*, resolution six, p. 97.
27. *Report of the Fifth Conference*, p 93.
28. *Report of the Second Conference*, resolution nine, p. 54.
29. *Report of the First Conference*, rules of the Conference, No. 8.
30. A brief survey of these reports is given in the *Report of the Thirteenth Conference*, p. 44.

takers were to determine whether the child was absent from school for reasons of poverty, religious feelings, carelessness or something else. This contact was then followed by a letter from Beck pointing out the advantages of learning English and urging parents to send their sons to schools, particularly those schools where they could begin to acquire English education.[31]

The census was in operation for three years: reports were delivered at the Eighth, Ninth and Tenth Conferences. A total of 1,932 families were interviewed and it was concluded that the vast majority of these refused to send their sons to school out of carelessness.[32] This was a general term that seemed to mean ignorance or apathy. Most families promised to do something about the education of their sons and, as a follow up, schools were started in different areas with the financial backing of the families.[33]

Beck, like Sir Saiyad, believed that character and ability were inherited. He believed that leadership for the community must come from the inherent good qualities of respectable families. Beck tried to translate this notion of 'good blood' into practical terms by promoting separate educational activities among the different communities of Sheikhs, Pathans, Moguls and Saiyads. Another census was taken among the Sheikhs of a section of the North West Provinces and the Punjab by Abdul Ghafur, Deputy Collector of Kanpur. According to a summary of this census delivered at the Tenth Conference, 10,000 persons in 27 different cities were questioned about their incomes and the education of their sons and daughters.[34] An effort was made to establish schools for as many boys as possible.

(4) In addition to the work of the District Committees, other efforts were made to spread knowledge of the work of the Conference. Proceedings of the Conference were translated into English,[35] resolutions were published and sold in different cities,[36] and a special volume of all the resolutions passed in the first ten years of the Conference was prepared for mailing to Calcutta and Bombay. Starting with the Eleventh Conference, increased efforts were made

31. *Report of the Ninth Conference*, p. 110.
32. *Report of the Thirteenth Conference*, p. 47.
33. *Report of the Thirteenth Conference*, p. 48.
34. *Report of the Tenth Conference*, pp. 84-86.
35. *Report of the Fifth Conference*, resolution four, p. 148.
36. *Report of the Seventh Conference*, resolution two, p. 101.

to publicise the annual meeting through newspapers, posters, special letters and invitations. In October 1896, Mohsin-ul-Mulk and Barkat Ali Khan went on special tours speaking to local groups about the work and aims of the Conference. Mohsin-ul-Mulk went to Poona and Bombay and then toured 10 towns in the North West Provinces and Oudh while Barkat Ali Khan toured the Punjab.[37]

(5) An Education Department was founded at the Tenth Conference to supervise the schools affiliated with the MAO College. All existing private English schools for Muslims were to be asked to join the Department and to submit to its guidance which included the right to promote, demote and transfer teachers.[38] No further mention is made of this department.

(6) The lectures delivered at the annual sessions included historical essays, treatises on ethics and morals, and reports on educational progress among the Muslims. One of the most famous lectures, later translated into English and published, was Saiyad Mahmud's "A History of English Education in India, 1781—1893." It was a description of the benefits of English education and an analysis of educational progress among the Muslims from 1873 to 1893. It represented the Aligarh view that college level education was most important to the community and that the progress of the community in the last 20 years had been slow at best. He avoided the controversial issues, particularly that of why the Muslims lagged so far behind the other communities. Other important lectures were delivered by Muhammad Shah Din, Zaka-Ullah, Wahi-ud-Din on educational topics and by Nazir Ahmad and Mohsin-ul-Mulk on historical and moral questions.

After Sir Saiyad

The years from 1897 to 1899 were a turning point for the Conference. The Conference did not meet in 1897 because of widespread sickness and because no one issued invitations. It was also clear that many had become discouraged and disheartened by the increase of poetry reading at the annual meetings and by the lack of constructive results. With Sir Saiyad's death in April 1898, Beck's death in September 1899, and Saiyad Mahmud's withdrawal from Muslim leadership, the scene was set for change. The credit for breathing new life into the Conference goes largely to Mohsin-ul-

37. *Report of the Eleventh Conference*, pp. 56-70.
38. *Report of the Tenth Conference*, resolution two, p. 63.

Mulk, who became the Secretary of the Conference when he took over reins of the College, and Barkat Ali Khan. The latter was responsible for reconvening the Conference in Lahore in 1898. From that time on it was apparent that efforts were being made to break old patterns and to steer the Conference in new directions. These remarks are based on an examination of only three of the Conferences subsequent to 1898 and meant to suggest the outlines of a new orientation.

First of all, the Conference finally broke its regional bonds. The sessions after Lahore were held in Calcutta, Rampur, Madras, Delhi and Bombay. Membership was drawn from other areas in significant numbers and the educational interests and problems of other areas were discussed. The format of the Conference was tightened; poems were forbidden, time limits were placed on speeches, regulations were adopted to assure the early printing of the annual report, and the finances of the Conference were separated from those of the College.[39] The resolutions became a mixture of general Muslim concerns and of regional issues of the area in which the Conference was held.

There are signs that the traditional, Persianized, urban nobility played a less dominant role. More speeches were delivered in English although for the annual report they had to be translated into Urdu. A larger number of resolutions and speeches seemed to offer a more critical examination of traditional institutions and ways of thinking. Old issues were discussd with a new twist. In the Seventh Conference, for example, a resolution recommended giving support to Yunani medicine which was thought to be as good as Western medicine.[40] In the Thirteenth Conference, a resolution acknowledged that Yunani medicine was an art and suited the needs of many in the community but urged that Western medicine was also necessary and that more Muslim students should study it.[41]

Finally, the Conference was now supported by many Muslim leaders who had previously avoided it either because of Sir Saiyad's views on politics or for personal reasons. Amir Ali and Badr-ud-Din Tyabji became Presidents of the Conference in 1899 and 1903 when

---

39. *Report of the Thirteenth Conference*, p. 13.
40. *Report of the Seventh Conference*, resolution seven, p 142.
41. *Report of the Thirteenth Conference*, resolution sixteen, p. 147.

the Conference was convened in Calcutta and Bombay and the Agha Khan attended Conference from 1902 on when he also served as President of the Delhi Session. From 1898 on at a time when it was becoming evident that Muslims were not going to join the Indian National Congress, the Conference became the first all India Muslim organization attracting those leaders and drawing from that constituency which in 1906 founded the Muslim League.

Conclusion

The foregoing gives some idea of the Muhammadan Educational Conference as an educational forum from 1886 to 1898. In terms of Sir Saiyad's expressed objectives the Conference was far from successful. It did not convert many more Muslims to Sir Saiyad's sense of priorities on educational issues. It did not lead to increased financial support for the College. Nor did it inspire much enthusiasm or desire among Muslims to do something about Muslim educational problems : the exceptions to this were members of the Aligarh group. The Conference may have accomplished something in the area of essay writing and cultural renewal or may have acted as a symbol and reminder to Muslims to stay away from the Indian National Congress but these were not the most important areas to Sir Saiyad.

A question which emerges from the experience of the Conferences in this period is that of why there was not more response. Why did not Muslims attend from outside North India ? Why did not the Muslims who did attend do more ? The proximity of the Conference to the Aligarh Movement obviously had something to do with it. So also did Sir Saiyad's presence. The Conference was his and, even though there was vocal opposition to many of his ideas, no one was willing to try and direct the resources of the Conference far from Sir Saiyad's goals One must also remember that many Muslims were in fact doing something about Muslim education but not within the structure of the Conference. Numerous cultural associations throughout North India like the ***Anjuman Islamia***, the ***Anjuman Himayat i Islam***, and the ***Anjuman Mufid i Am*** were sponsoring schools. In addition, many of the *ulama* were supporting recently established *madrasahs* like the Dar-ul-Ulum of Deoband. The real failure of the Conference was not attracting more Muslims from groups like these.

Muhammadan Educational Conference 1886—1903

S. No.	*Year*	*Place*	*President*	*Members*	*Visitors*
1.	1886	Aligarh	Sami-Ullah Khan	87	
2.	1887	Lucknow	Imtiyaz Ali Khan	130	
3.	1888	Lahore	Md. Hayat Khan	258	
4.	1889	Aligarh	Md. Hayat Rhan	442	
5.	1890	Allahabad	Md. Hayat Khan	955	96
6.	1891	Aligarh[1]	Md. Ishaq Khan	449	29
7.	1892	Delhi	Md. Hashmat-Ullah	613	128
8.	1893	Aligarh	Mohsin-ul-Mulk	672	118
9.	1894	Aligarh[2]	Md. Shah Din	399	30
10.	1895	Shahjehanpore[3]	Mohsin-ul-Mulk	547	161
11.	1896	Meeruth	Saiyad Husain Bilgrami	776	130
	1897	Conference did not meet[5]			
12.	1898	Lahore	Fateh Ali Khan	1000	
13.	1899	Calcutta	Amir Ali	Not Available	
14.	1900	Rampur[4]	Saiyad Husain Bilgrami	645	157
15.	1901	Madras	Justice Badam	1103	391
16.	1902	Delhi	Agha Khan	1036	310
17.	1903	Bombay	Badr-ud-Din Tyabji	Not Avilable	

1. Supposed to meet in Patna. Cancelled due to the deaths of two members of the local managing committee.
2. Supposed to meet in Amritsar. The local managing committee cancelled the Conference. No reason was given.
3. Supposed to meet in Bombay. Cancelled because Sir Saiyad could not travel to Bombay.
4. Supposed to meet in Patna. Cancelled due to the plague.
5. Different reasons given ; the plague, widespread sikness, no one willing to host the Conference.

Geographical Distribution of Members

Year	Total	NWP	Punjab	Oudh	Bihar	C.P.	Bombay	Calcutta	Madras	Hydera-bad	Other Princely States	Others, No place mentioned
1886	87	43	18	12	5	8	—	—	—	—	—	1
1887	130	48	19	46	7	—	—	—	—	—	3	7
1888	258	35	177	16	8	—	—	—	—	—	8	14
1889	442	102	295	15	7	—	—	—	—	—	8	28
1890	955	547	210	49	34	8	1	—	2	—	20	84
1891	449	108	203	6	17	11	2	—	—	60	31	11
1892	613	164	299	6	8	13	4	—	1	38	43	37
1893	672	Not	Availa-ble	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1894	399	131	165	11	7	10	1	—	2	9	34	29
1895	547	322	138	23	3	6	2	2	2	8	31	10
1896	776	324	247	14	6	6	5	—	2	5	69	98
1898	1000	Not	Availa-ble	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1899	--	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
1900	645	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—

Sources for the Study of Medieval Indian History

DR. JAGADISH NARAYAN SARKAR*

Periodisation

History is a continuous stream of events in human affairs, ideas and ideals, in politics, society and culture including literature, philosophy, religion and art Any attempt at periodisation is bound to be somewhat arbitrary and inadequate. One period shades imperceptibly into another. Nevertheless periodisation has been found to be convenient. In Europe the Middle Ages are considered to have lasted for about 1000 years, from the fall of Rome in A.D. 476 before the barbarians to the fall of Constantinople in A.D. 1453 before the Turks leading first to the Renaissance and then to the Reformation. In India the Middle Ages are usually considered to have lasted from the Turkish conquests in Northern India from the 13th century to mid-eighteenth century when the British established their supermacy in Bengal. For purposes of this paper, and the subject under consideration, viz., Medieval Indo-Muslim historiography, we have to consider the period from C. A.D. 712—C. 1757, i.e., roughly a little more than 1000 years.

True, the modern conception of a scientific, humanistic, rational, self-revelatory and interpretative history was unknown to the medieval historians. But it was on a medieval base, partly Hindu and mainly Muslim, that the pioneers of modern Indian historiography on medieval period raised their structure of history. It must be admitted that the house of medieval Indian history in which we are living today and which we are endeavouring to reconstruct, develop or beautify is the legacy of the past thirteen hundred years or so. To this culmination have contributed successive generations of scholars of various nationalities, British, non-British (French, Dutch, German, Russian, American and others), Indian and Pakistani during well-nigh two centuries.

Categories and Content

The broad categories of the sources of the Turko-Afghan and Mughal periods are as follows : (I) Literary Sources, (II) Travel

*Dr. Jagadish Narayan Sarkar, M.A. (Pat.), Ph.D. (Cal), F.A.S., U.G.C. Professor of History, Jadavpur University, Calcutta.

Literature or Accounts of Foreign Travellers, Agents, Merchants, etc., (III) Archaeological, epigraphic and numismatic sources. For the Mughal period we have to delve into (IV) European Factory Records as well.

I. *Literary Sources*

Corresponding to the social dichotomy of the period there was a dichotomy in historiography as well.

(A) *Hindu Historiography*

Ancient India suffered from paucity of professed histories, though there existed various categories of sources, literary or otherwise.

(a) The Kashmir historian, Kalhana, author of *Rajatarangini* (wr. A.D. 1148-9), stands almost alone among Indian historians, ancient and medieval. But no other Hindu historian of the period could approach his standard, just as the lines chalked out by Ibn Khaldun do not appear to have been worked out by any other Arabic writer.

(b) *Rajput Bardic Literature*

Indian bardic literature goes back to antiquity and is based on oral tradition and records, written in Dingal (a form of archaic Rajasthani) and Pingal (Brajabhasa), and maintained by professional bards and genealogists. The bards, who were generally eye-witnesses of the deeds of their patrons, preserved their genealogical records and passed them to their own sons and the chain continued in the family. According to Tessitori, who undertook a systematic survey of this literature (1914-19), neither Forbes nor Todunde rtook any critical analysis of their sources, which must be divided into two broad categories, bardic poetry and prose chronicles. (i) Bardic poetry includes historical poems, the Raesas (poetical legends) and commemorative songs of Chārans and Bhats. (ii) The prose chronicles were subdivided into chronicles proper (*Khyāt*) and genealogies (*Pidhiyāvali*) These were not produced by bards, but by trained officials and genealogists respectively. It is the Khyāts or chronicles proper which constituted the history of a Rajput state in chronological order, growing up about the end of the 16th century, the impulse coming from Akbar. Muhnot Nainsi compiled his Khyāt during 1650-66. Though not strictly historical, it is an embodiment of much information gleaned from documents (from Khyāts of bards, traditions and *vamsavālis*, in old Marwari and Dingal preserved in the state archives of Rajputana for nearly two centuries at least. Tod, unaware of the real chronicles, depended on the poetical chronicles which the Rajput princes had got wri-

tten in the 18th and 19th centuries. The bardic literature contains historical material but does not constitute history. Accurate for social and cultural conditions (as Forbes and Haimendorf respectively say), it is defective for chronology.

(c) *Ahom and Assamese Buranjis*

The Buranjis primarily deal with the reigns of Ahom Kings for 600 years (1226-1826) with occasional glimpses of Shah rulers and princes prior to their advent to Assam. These were written originally in Ahom, the language of the rulers, but subsequently in Assamese which became the court language. Compiled under orders of Kings and of State officials, these were based on state documents, reports of generals and governors, foreign diplomatic correspondence, judicial and revenue documents and court news, etc. These Buranjis have been studied and edited by Dr. S.K. Bhuyan and other scholars.

(d) *Maratha Bakhars*

The Peshwa period (1707-1802) is illumined by 'a vast and varied mass' of contemporary records (Marathi, Persian and English, etc.); the royal period (1660-1700) suffers from absence of state papers, official histories, personal memoirs and public letters. Though there are nine Bakhars or chronicles of Shivaji, there are 'no contemporary records of a truly historical nature in Marathi for the royal period.' What exist are in the English, Persian, Portuguese and Rajasthani languages.

(i) *91 Qalmi Bakhar* : The earliest Marathi work on Shivaji was written by his official chronicler (*Waqnis—waqāi-nawīs*) about 1685. Only extracts now remain (with interpolations) in 91 sections.

(ii) *Sabhasad Bakhar*, written at Rajaram's request at Jinji (1697) by his officer, Krishnaji Anand Sabhasad, is 'the first in date and importance...the only work that can claim to be contemporary' (Sen) and preserved intact. Though not based on state papers and written notes, and written from memory, it is the 'most valuable Maratha account of Shivaji' (Sarkar).

(iii) *Chitnis Bakhar*, by Malhar Ram Rao Chitnis, written 130 years after Shivaji's death, is valuable for the administrative system of the Marathas.

(iv) *Siva-digvijaya*, the 'most voluminous Bakhar', relied on by some modern Maratha scholars, but neither Sen nor Sarkar had a high opinion about it.

(v) Regarding some contemporary Sanskrit laudatory poems

about Shivaji, scholars differ in their opinions. Sarkar regards *Shiva Bharat* by Shivaji's court poet, Paramananda, to be 'worthless', being over-laudatory ('beating Abul Fazl hollow') and ascribing supernatural feats to his hero. Patwardhan and Rawlinson, however, hold a more moderate view : the historical framework, shorn of the proneness to exaggeration, to be accurate and confirmed at places, by contemporary Marathi or English records; and the chronological sequence reliable.

(e) *Sikh Sources*

The historical literature of the Sikhs include works in Gurumukhi (e.g., *Adī-Granth*, *Dasam Pādshāh Kā Grānth*, *Bachitra Nātak*, *Srī Gur Sobhā*, *Gur Bilās*, the *Sākhī* Books), and in Persian (e.g., *Zafarnāmāh*, *Zindagīnāmāh*).

General Characteristics of Hindu Historical Literature : Lack of Critical acumen

Briefly speaking neither the bardic literature of Rajputana, the ballads, the heroic poems, and the *Raesas* (or poetical legends of princes) on which Tod relied, the Khyāts (or comprehensive historical chronicles) of medieval Rajasthan, nor the Ahom and Assamese Buranjis (or chronicles) of Assam (1226-1826), neither the Maratha Bakhars nor the Sikh sources and Sakhi Books can strictly be regarded as histories proper, though they constitute evidence for historical purpose and fall within the range of annalistic or quasi-historical literature Weak in content, these were also generally weaker in chronology. Nor was the science of historical criticism known to the medieval Rajput bards and the writers of the Ahom Buranjis and the Maratha Bakhars. Generally speaking, they were incapable of sifting evidence and were over-credulous of divine and non-human agencies. They recorded what they heard or believed to be true,—to please the patron, or amuse the people. These limitations make these works unsuitable for political history. Further, modern ideas of social or economic history were unknown to the medieval Indian Hindu chroniclers.

But these Hindu historical or quasi-historical literature and non-Muslim works on literature, theology, etc., possess a value of a different kind. In the first place, they contain valuable data for the social and cultural historian. In the second place they serve as a check on and sometimes as a supplement to Muslim chronicles.

(B) *Medieval Indo-Moslem Historiography*

The advent of the Muslims and the establishment of Turkish rule in India constituted a seminal age in Indian historiography. Historical literature was a notable gift of the Persianised Turks to India. Certain distinctive stages can be discerned in the development of historical literature in or on medieval India corresponding to the broad stages of political development, viz.,

(a) the period of Arab contact (8th to 10th centuries);
(b) the period of the advent of the Turks and of the Delhi Sultanate (11th to 16th centuries);
(c) the Mughal age (16th to 18th centuries).

In fact medieval Muslim historiography in India did not remain unchanged and static during the long period of one thousand years. Pre-Mughal and Mughal histories had, of course, certain things in common but these were cast in difficult moulds.

Section (a) Period of Arab Contact

There were the early Arab geographers and the historians of Sind. The writings of the latter reflect the influence not only of Arab historiography but also of the local tradition. The earliest example of regional history in Muslim annals in India, as distinct from the history of Islam and universal history, is the *Chachnama* or *Tarikh-i-Hind-wa-Sind* (written before 753 A.D.). It was translated from Arabic in the time of Nasiruddin Qabacha (1216) by Muhammad Ali. Subsequent writers like Nizamuddin, Nural Haqq, Ferishta, Mir Masum drew upon this work. Elphinstone had a good opinion about it.

Section (b) Period of the advent of the Turks and Delhi Sultanate
(11th to 16th centries)—Pre-Mughal Indo-Persian histories

Though not strictly historical, Alberuni's work forms a class by itself.

The works of the 13th to 15th centuries may be grouped in six broad categories :

(i) General history of the Moslem world, e.g., *Tabaqat-i-Nasiri* by Minhaj-ud-Din-us-Siraj (1259-60), and *Tarikh-i-Muhammadi* by Muhammad Bihamand Khani (1438-9).

(ii) Regional history of Islam in Northern India, e.g., *Tarikh-i-Mubarak Shahi* by Yahya bin Ahmad Sirhindi (wr. 1434-35) (from Md. Ghuri to Sultan Sayyid Muhammad).

(iii) *Manaqib* or *Fazail* or prose eulogy of rulers or other individuals, viz ,

Tarikh-i-Yamini of Al Utbi (1020-1)—Mahmud of Ghazni.

Tarikh-i-Baihaqi of Al Baihaqi (c. 996-1077) : 30 vols., dealing with Sabuktigin, Mahmud and Masud.

Jawami-ul-Hikayat wa Lawam-i-ul-Riwayat (Collections of stories and illustrations of Histories) by Maulana Nuruddin Muhammad al-Awfi, a contemporary of Qubacha and Iltutmish and dedicated to a minister of Iltutmish (Nizam-ul-mulk Muhammad); *Tarikh-i-Alai/ Khuzain-ul-Futuh* by Amir Khusrau.

Tarikh-i-Firuz Shahi by Shamsuddin Siraj Afif (c. 1398-9).

Sirat-i-Firuz Shahi (c. 1370), anonymous.

(iv) Didactic history : regarding history as a branch of ethics ; e.g., *Tarikh-i-Firoz Shahi* (wr. 1358) by Ziauddin Barani, according to whom history contains an element of divine truth.

(v) Artistic history : in poetry ; panegyrical notices of masters by officials: e.g., Hasan Nizami, *Taj-ul-Maasir*; Amir Khusrau (1253-1325)—5 poems; Isami, *Futuh-us-Salatin* (wr. 1349-50), histrical epic.

(vi) Royal Autobiography : The nearest approach was *Futuhat-i-Firoz Shahi* by Sultan Firuz Shah.

General Characteristics of Pre-Mughal Works

Medieval Muslim historiography reflected mainly two distinct traditions of history writing—Arab and Persian. Arab historiography had a wide range covering society, institutions, politics and culture, in a word, the history of the age. Persian historiography had a narrower limit, the history of the rulers. Unlike the Arab historian, the Persian was a courtly flatterer of his patron.

Early medieval Indo-Moslem historiography grew up in a tradition of Turko-Persian culture and largely bore the impress of Persian tradition revolving round 'great men' rather than Arab tradition, the authors being either connected with royal courts or solicitous of royal patronage. Fakhr-i-Mudabbir Mubarak Shah's work (*Shajara-i-ansab-i-Mubarak Shahi*), on universal history from 1173, lacks the critical approach of Arabic historiography.

Section (c) Mughal historiography (16th to 18th centuries)

If pre-Mughal historiography was extra-Indian in inspiration and methodology, Mughal historiography reflected 'a distinctive Indian historical tradition' (Gibb). In fact it was the result of three

trends uniting ; the continuing Indo-Persian tradition (of writing general historical as well as regional histories), the tradition of Herat school ; and the new distinctive forms of the Mughals (viz., official chronicles, memoirs, development of historical biography).

The historical writings and semi-historical literature of the Mughal age (16th – 18th centuries) may be grouped under the following heads. Some of these served as channels to secularise history-writing during the Mughal period.

(a) Official records or Court bulletins (*Akhbarat-i-darbar-i-mu'alla*), where we find the Mughal officialdom at work and play, is a unique form of historical literature.

(b) Official histories, a novel feature of the Mughal age, inspired by Persian influence. With the recording of events by experienced officials and courtiers, practised clerks and secretaries, a change came over history in form, content and spirit alike, e.g., *Akbarnamah*, *Padshahnamah*, *Alamgirnamah* and *Maasir-i-Alamgiri*, *Bahadurshahnamah*. Aurangzeb stopped the practice from 11th year—moral scruples and financial reasons.

(c) Royal autobiographies and memoirs ; another novel introduction by the Timurides,—written by members of royal family and private persons, e g., *Malfuzat-i-Timuri* or *Tuzuk-i-Timuri* (in Chaghtai Turki), *Tuzuk-i-Baburi*, *Tuzuk-i Jahangiri*.

Memoirs : e.g., (1) *Tarikh-i-Rashidi* by Mirza Haidar Dughlat, Babur's cousin, (2) *Humayunamah* by Gulbadan Begum, (3) *Tazkirat-ul-Waqiat* by Jauhar Aftabchi, (4) *Waqiat-i-Asad Beg* : author in Abul Fazl's service for 17 years till the latter's murder. Akbar appointed him a mansabdar and asked him to report on the failure of the expedition to Bijapur and Golkanda. He narrates his experiences.

(d) Non-official or Private histories (correcting the official accounts at times : e.g., *Waqiat-i-Baburi* by Zainuddin, *Habib-us-Siyar* by Khwand Amir, Bayazid Bayat's *Mukhtasar Tarikh-i-Humayun* and *Tarikh-i-Humayun wa Akbar*. *Tabaqat-i-Akbari* by Nizamuddin Ahmad, *Tarikh-i-Muhammad Arif Qandahari* (fragment up to 1579-80). *Tarikh-i-Ferishta* by Ferishtah, *Muntakhab-ul-Lubab* by Md. Hashim or Hashim Ali Khan (Khafi Khan); Abul Fazl Mamuri (History of the Reign of Aurangeb, Rampur Ms.).

(e) Provincial or local histories : like imperial prototypes in the Delhi Sultanate and Mughal empire.

(I) Northern India : (a) Kashmir (*Tarikh-i-Azami*, 1748) ; (b) Eastern

India—Bengal and Assam. e.g., *Baharistan-i-Ghaibi* by Mirza Nathan entitled Shitab Khan (Bengal); *Tarikh-i-Shah Shujai* by Md. Masum; Salimullah, *Tarikh-i- Bangalah*; Ghulam Husain Salim, *Riyaz us-Salātin*; *Tarikh-i-Assam* by Shihabuddin Talish (Assam) and its continuation (Bengal); (c) Western India: Gujrat: *Tarikh-i-Gujrat* by Turab Ali; Arabic histories of Gujrat by Abdullah; *Mirat-i-Sikandari* by Sikandar bin Md. (1613); *Mirat-i-Ahmadi* of Ali Md. Khan (1750-60) (Gujrat 1000-1760). These reproduced the main features of Mughal historiograhy. For Sind there are a few works like *Tarikh-us-Sind* by Mir Muhammad Ma'sum of Bhakkar or *Tarikh-i-Masumi* (wr. 1600) *and Tuhfat-ul-Kiram* by 'Ali Sher Kani, the third volume being considered 'the most comprehensive and consistent of all the histories of Sind'.

(II) For the Deccan kingdom, there are: (a) For Bijapur: *Tazkirat-ul-Muluk* (1611); Fuzuni Astarbadi: *Fatuhat-i-Adil Shahi*; *Basatin-us-Salatin* by Mirza Ibrahim Zubairi (valuable and accurate, 1824), *Muhammadnamah* by Maulana Muhammad Zahur bin Zahuri, *Tarikh-i-Ali Adil Shah II* by Sayyid Nurullah, (b) For Golkonda: *Tarikh-i-Md. Qutb Shah* by Habibullah; *Maasir-i-Qutb Shah; Hadiqat-us-Salatin* by Nizamuddin Ahmad; *Waqai* (conquest of Golkonda) by Mirza Muhammad Niamat Khan 'Ali; *Qutbnuma* by Abdullah. (c) Ahmadnagar: *Burhan-i-Maasir* by Ali b. Aziz Tabatabai (Bahm. K., and its offshoots up to 1694), etc.

(f) *Biographical Literature*

The framework of history is one of thought, that of biography is one of narration of natural or biological process. Personal or ordinary biography revolves round the life-story of an individual. Historical biography is one which revolving round a person or persons, transcends the narrow limits of mere historical evolution, and in a sense partakes of the character of true history and even of universal history, involving due research, interpretation and historical thought processes. The concept of historical biography in the west is said to have grown in the age of the Italian Renaissance. But in olden times biography was intimately connected with contemporary history and culture. The 'great man' theory of historical interpretation, though controversial, has been very popular throughout the ages in Greeco-Roman, medieval European and medieval Muslim historiography. It would thus be difficult to draw a hard and fast line of division between history and biography.

Biographies, biographical dictionaries, e. g., *Maasir-i-Rahimi*,

biography of Abdur Rahim Khan-i-Khanan, by Abdul Baqi Nihawandi (wr. 1616); *Lataif-ul-Akhbar* of Rashid Kh. (Dara's Q. camp), *Zakhirat-ul-Khwanin* by Shaikh Farid Bhakkari (temp. Shahjahan), with biographical notices of nobles under Akbar, Jahangir and Sahahjahan and *Maasir-ul-Umara* or biographical dictionary of Mughal peers (1742-79) by Shah Nawaz Khan. We may very well include works like royal autobiographies, official annals and some non-official histories in this category of biographical literature.

(g) *Gazetteers* like Abul Fazl's *Ain-i-Akbari* and Amin Ahmad Razi's *Haft Iqlim* supply us with statistical, geographical and biographical details.

(h) *Correspondence* : Letters, official or private, constitute a very important source of history of the Mughal period : e.g., *Insha-i-Abul Fazl*, collected by Abdus Samad after his death (1602); Aurangzeb's correspondence (*Adab-i-Alamgiri, Ahkam-i-Alamgiri, Kalimat-i-Tayyibat, Kalimat-i-Aurangzeb, Ruqaat-i-Alamgiri*, etc.; the *Haft Anjuman* of Udairaj alias Talayar Khan, *Ruqaat-i-Shah Abbas Sani* of Tahir Wahid, *Khatut-i-Shivaji, Faiyyaz-ul-Qawanin*.

(i) Administrative Manuals or *Dastur-ul-Amals*, describing the method of administration, giving figures of land revenue and throwing light on political problems, e.g., *Hidayat-ul-Qawaid* (1715) of Hedayatullah Bihari, a disciple of Shah Ahmad Munawwar of Maner (Patna district).

Afghan histories, written by Afghan writers, naturally biased, favourable or even eulogistic to their heroes, the Lodis and the Surs, e.g., *Tarikh-i-Sher Shahi* or *Tuhfa-i-Akbar Shahi* by Abbas Sarwani, *Makhzan-i-Afghana and Tarikh-i-Khan Jahan Lodi wa Makhzan-i-Afghana* by Niamatullah (written c. Jahangir), *Tarikh-i-Daudi* by Abdullah, *Waqiat-i-Mushtaqi* by Rizqullah.

Hindu Historians :

At first writers writing in Persian were either foreign immigrants or their descendants. Gradually it came to be cultivated even by Muslims and Hindu whose mother tongue was not Persian.

Hindu historians' writings in Persian in Mughal India followed the same technique as the Muslim historians writing in Persian.

(i) Brindaban (entitled Rai), son of Rai Bihara Mal, diwan of Dara, wrote *Lubb-ut-Tawarikh-i-Hind* (Marrow of Histories of India, 1696), to remove the defects of Ferishta's work.

(ii) Bhimsen Burhanpuri, a hereditary Kayastha civil officer of

the Mughals, spent his life in Mughal cities and camps of the Deccan and saw many places from Cape Comorin to Delhi. His journal *Nuskha-i-Dilkusha* (c. 1708-9) is very valuable, supplementing the *Maasir-i-Alamgiri*. He 'knew the truth and could afford to tell the truth', and he was free from the worst defects of the official historians. He has supplied many things which are lacking in the complete official history of Aurangzeb's reign—causes and effects of events, state of the country, condition of the people, their amusements, prices of food, condition of roads, social life of the official class and incidents in Mughal warfare. For Maratha history under Shivaji, it is also of great value, though defective in chronology. He pays a high tribute to Shivaji's genius for organization. He may well be regarded as a social historian of the times.

Ishwardas Nagar, a Brahman of Patan in Gujrat, author of *Futuhat-i-Alamgiri* (1731), served the Chief Qazi of the empire and a viceroy of the Deccan and could know correct facts from officials or their servants.

Sujan Rai. *Khulasat-ut-Tawarikh*.

General characteristics of Mughal historiography :

(i) The histories of Muslim India by Nizamuddin Ahmad and Abdul Qadir Budauni were the first definite exponents of the new Indian tradition that grew up under the Mughals.

(ii) The official histories were a novel feature of the period.

(iii) The regional chronicles, though less extensive than the general chronicles, reproduced the main features of Mughal historiography.

(iv) The memoirs were 'the most original feature of Indo-Persian historiography.'

(v) In biographical literature, the new development was the addition of historical biography to the pre-existing literary biography.

(vi) A change is also discernible in the type of history and class of writers of historical literature in the Mughal age. Royal autobiographers, memoir-writers (Mirza Haidar Dughlat, Gulbadan and others), official historiographers (e.g., Abul Fazl, Lahori, Md. Kazim and Md. Saqi Mustaid Khan), non-official historians (Nizamuddin, Budauni) differ from the writers of the Sultanate period in social status, class, outlook, idiom and approach. The element of personal gain, getting a reward or repaying a debt of gratitute receded into the background or at least was not so prominent now as in the previous period. The most significant change was the secularisation of history in the Mughal age.

Though the attitude of divine ordination in history is noticeable in this age, the humanistic aspect of history tended to be more marked and the divine causation less prominent in the Mughal period than in the preceding age. Further the didactic element in history diminished in the Mughal age, when historians devoted more attention to events, actions and measures taken, political, administrative or military, of their causes and effects than general morals or vague warnings.

Elliot has pointed out the limitations of Hindu writers in Persian: (i) manifesting the usual deficiencies of Muslim historians, (ii) not throwing light on the feelings, hopes, etc., of the oppressed Hindus, (iii) writing to order and flatter the patron, (iv) using the phraseology of the Muslim writers. But Sir Jadunath Sarkar holds a different opinion. They looked at the reign from the Hindu angle, knew the events accurately but were not 'lying flatterers'.

First half of 18th century

A few representative examples are noted below :

(a) *Official histories* :

Bahadurshahnamah, the official history of the fitst two years of Bahadur Shah's reign by Danishmand Khan (Nimat Khan Ali).

(b) *Chronicles* :

Siyar-ul-Mutakherin (comp. 1782) by Ghulam Hussain Tabatabai (of Patna), a general history of India with special reference to Bengal from 1738

Anand Ram Mukhlis's works : He was *wakil* of Qamruddin Khan (Wazir of Muhammad Shah) and also of Zakariya Khan (governor of Lahore and Multan). Several of his tracts deal with Nadir Shah's invasion. One is a dictionary of official terms, idioms, proverbs, etc.

(c) *Biographical dictionaries* :

Maasir-ul-Umara (wr. 1742-79) by Shah Nawaz Khan and his son Abdul Hayy.

Tazkirat-ul-Umara (1780) by Kewal Ram, a general index of mansabdars and list of governors of provinces from Akbar's time and revenues of the empire.

(d) *Statistical accounts* :

Muntakhab-ut-Tawarikh by Jagjivan Das (wr. 1708), giving statistics of all provinces in 1707.

Chahar Gulshan by Chatarman Rai (part tr. by Jadunath).

(e) *Official Records* :

The *Akhbhārāt* virtually end with the deposition of Farrukhsiyar.

The Jaipur State records (now in Bikaner) contain *akhbarat*, *farmans*, *hasb-ul-hukums*, *parwanahs* besides Vakils' reports and business papers.

(f) *Regional histories* :

Rohillas
Hyderabad
Bengal

Section D : Contemporary Literature

It is a platitude to say that literature is the mirror of society. Prof. S. Hasan Askari has shown the immense possibilities of extracting gems of historical, social and cultural interest from non-political e.g., *Basatin-ul-Uns*, *Ijaz-i-Khusravi* (719 H). Some idea of the contents of *Ijaz i Khusravi* may be gathered from the following :

1. Duties and position of the King—security.
2. Army
3. Peasant, tradesmen and workers, 'the sweat of whose eyebrows falling on the ground become pearls.'
4. Trade : (a) Coastal regions of Ma'abar and Malabar—boats and ships should ply on the ocean up to Kish and Hormuz (in Persian Gulf). (b) A *farman* was issued (709 H.) to merchants of the sea and the ports re: transport of gifts and goods of Arabia, Habsha (Ethiopia), Bahrain, Barbar, Maghrib and Syria: "The traders of the port of Kambhayet, who are so opulent and active on the sea, have brought some precious things (*nafais)* by sea for the imperial treasury and they should give their delivery to the ***Mutasarrifs*** (revenue officers) of Naharwalla. They constantly ply their vessels on the waters of those directions and the rarities of Maghrib and Sham (Syria) reach continuously and in succession to this side. They should take their vessels to Jerusalam *(Bait-ul-Muqaddas)* and bring them back. The other merchandise, carried in their vessels from Ethiopia and Barbari, include the black slaves of Abyssinia whose services are utilised in guarding the harem and as soldiers. Their salty black colour is attractive in its own way. The negro slaves of Zanjibar (Zanzibar) and Darya (?) are of gigantic size and very swiftfooted. They were all recipients of royal favours."

(c) Envoys from Qipchag (Tartary) came with Tartar horse, 1000 Turkish slave girls and 500 pieces of Russian linen *(Katan)* for Prince Khizr Khan.

It is, however, a most difficult task for a single scholar to utilise the entire gamut of contemporary literature in *all* regional languages

in studying the medieval period of Indian history, for nearly 1000 years. But these are a *must* for research, and patient plodding will be necessary to collect incidental details relating to the subject matter of one's research project. Here I will refer only to

Bengali Literature.

I. Pre-Chaitanya Period : The oldest form of Bengali literature, represented by the *Charya-padas* ended before the close of 12th century. After a gap of nearly 200 years we find Bengali as a fully developed literature, represented by Chandidas, Krittibas, Maladhar Basu, Vijaya-Gupta and Parameshwara.

II. Post-Chaitanya Period :

(a) The vast Vaishnava literature included biographies of Chaitanya, the fundamental principle of Chaitanya's Vaishnavism, *Padavali* (lyric poems), Krishna-mangala, Vaishnava Nibandha, Sahajiya Literature.

(b) Translations (in Bengali) of epic literature—the Ramayana, Mahabharata and of Bhagavata.

(c) 'Mangala' or 'Vijaya' Kavya—dealing with non-Puranic deities, Manasa (serpent deity), Chandi and Dharma Thakur, Siva, Kalika, Raya (Dakhinraya or tiger god) besides various others.

(d) Nath literature.

(e) Historical work—
in Tripura : *Rajamala* (15th-18th c.) in 4 parts;
in Bengal : *Maharastra Purana* by Gangaram,
Tirtha-mangala.

(f) Rhymed anecdotes *(Gitikas)*—Mymensingh and Purva Vanga.

(g) Bharatchandra (1712-80)—*Annada Mangala.*

(h) Ramaprasad Sen (c. 1720-81).

(i) Bengali literature in Cooch Behar and Tripura—
Sankardeva of Assam (16th century).

(j) *Contributions of Muslims to Bengali literature:*
Contributions of Muslim rulers.
Individual writers:

16th c. (i) Sābirid Khan : *Vidyasundara,*
(ii) Syed Sultan of Paragalpur (in Chittagong) wrote 3 books including *Jnana pradipa* on *yoga,*
(iii) Qutban's *Mrigavat* (1503),
(iv) *Yusuf-Julekha* by Shah Md. Sāgir.

17th c. (v) Muhammad Khan *(Makbul Hosain,* 1645), *(Satya-*

Kali Vivada Samvada) proficient in Sanskrit and Hindu Puranas,

(vi) *Laili-Majnu* by Bahram Khan of Chittagong.

18th c. (vii) Hayāt Mahmud:

(viii) *Nabi Vamsa*, *Rasulvijaya*, *Zanganama*, Works on the life of the Prophet and the religious wars of the preachers of Islam were written in imitation of the *Harivamsa* and *Mahabharata*.

(ix) *Tales of Pirs and Ghazis.*

(x) *Padāvolis*, by Muslim poets, e.g., Syed Murtaza.

(xi) *Pānchāli*, written by Hindus and Muslims: Satyanarayana and Satyapir.

(k) Bengali Literature in Arakan :

In 17th century Daulat Kazi and Ālā ol, two Bengali poets in Arakan, made the most important countribution to Bengali Literature. The first, patronised by Asraf Khan Lashkar Uzir or King, Sri Sudharma (1922-38) wrote *Sati Maynamati*. This incomplete work was completed by Alaol (b. c. 1600), who wrote *Padmavali* (a transiation of Jayasi's Padmavat c. mid 16th).

Section E : Religious Literature

(a) Muslim

The religious literature of the period includes biographies of saints and mystical literature.

There are well known biographies or histories of eminent Muslim Sufi saints in Persian or Arabie. They used Persian as one of their vehicles of expression. The records of their conversation were preserved in the *malfuzat*, their correspondence in *maktubat*.

Turko-Afghan Period :

(i) Shaikh Khwajah Muinuddin Chishti (1142-1235), the saint of Ajmer, came to India before the Ghurid conquest. His sayings (*Dalu'il Arifin*) were collected by his contemporary Khwaja Bakhtiyar Kaki.

(ii) The sayings of Bakhtiyar Kaki were compiled by Baba Farid Ganj-i-shakar (1175-1265) *Fawaid-us-Salikin.*

(iii) Baba Farid recorded his own mystical experiences *(Asrar-ul-Auliya)*.

(iv) The *malfuzat* of Nizamuddin Auliya (*Afzal-ush-Shawahid)* was collected by his disciple Amir Khusrau, and also by Sayyid Ali

Sanjari (in *Fawaid-ul-Fuad* 1307-22).

(v) Hazrat Banda Nawaz Gesu Daraz, the prolific saint of Gulbarga, wrote more than 100 books and pamphlets on Sufism.

Mughal Period :

During the Mughal period also there were several well known biographies or histories of Muslim saints :

1. *Siyar-ul-Arifin* by Shaikh Jamal.
2. *Manaqib-i-Ghausiya* (biography of Md. Ghaus Gwaliori, 1482-1562) by his disciple Shah Fazl Shattari.
3. *Akhbar-ul-Akhyar* by Shaikh Abdul Haq Dehlavi (1590).
4. *Siyar-ul-Iqtab* (bio. of Chishti saints) by Allah Ziya (wr. 1623-29).
5. *Safinat-ul-Auliya* (biographies of Saints) by Dara, with his own experiences.
6. *Sakinat-ul-Auliya* (bio. of Mian Mir) by Dara.
7. *Rubaiyat-i-Mulla Shah* (collection of quatrains, mostly Sufisitic; occasional incidents in lives of Mian Mir and Mulla Shah) by Mulla Shah Badakhshi.

The study of the religious history of various sects and saints, Hindu and Muslim, as well as medieval religious literature, Hindu and Muslim, is imperatively necessary for a correct appreciation of the general history of the period. Much work has been done on the subject but special mention must be made of the need of studying the *malfuzat* literature. While the contemporary works on *tafsir*, *hadis* and *fiqh* are not of much historical value, except giving a vague idea of the trend of the Muslim mind, the mystic literature, including *malfuzat* and general works on mystical topics, is of considerable historical value. It gives "glimpse of the medieval society... the moods and tensions of the common man, the inner yearnings of his soul, the religious thought at its higher and lower levels, the popular customs and manners and the problems of the people. There is no other type of literature through which we can feel the pulse of the medieval public...this literature acts as a corrective to the wrong impressions created by the contemporary political chronicles. Besides extremely valuable biographical details about leaders of ideas and religion, we get in this literature interesting information about the religious, ideas and institutions, superstitions and attitudes of the period. How the common man lived and thought ? What were his reactions to different situations of medieval life ? If any literature of medieval India give us any idea about these problems, it is certainly the mystic

literature of the period." Notable examples are :

(i) *Fawaid-ul-Fuad*, containing the conversations of Shaikh Nizam-ud-din Auliya (1307-1322) compiled by his disciple, Amir Hasan Sijzi.

(ii) *Sarur-us-Sudur*, the sayings of Shaikh Hamid-ud-din Nagauri and his son Shaikh Farid-ud-din Mahmud (compiled by the grandson of the former in the time of Muhammad bin Tughluq).

(iii) *Khair-ul-Majlis*, the conversations of Shaikh Nazir-ud-din Chiragh Dehlavi (mid. 14th c) compiled by his disciple, Maulana Hamid Qalandar. It has been used as a source book by almost all hagiographers of this period.

(iv) *The Siyar-ul-Auliya* of Amir Khurd (Kirmani) which has been regarded as "a mine of information for the religious and cultural life of the Sultanate period," especially 13th century *Khanqah* life.

(b) Hindu

Lives of Hindu saints, preachers and writings in different regions of India have also to be ransacked for reconstructing the socio-economic life of the period.

II. Travel Literature

Accounts of Foreign Travellers (of different countries, Asiatic, African, Chinese and European)

Travel Literature was one of the fullest and most remarkable kinds of composition produced by the Arabs (extent of empire, missionary and commercial activities, hajj, administrative needs). Their craze for geographical knowledge led them to record observations very valuable for political, socio-economic conditions in contemporary India, e.g., Sulaiman (851), a merchant, Ibn Khurdadba (912), al-Masudi (956), al-Istakhri (951) and others.

Ibn Batutah, the Moroccan traveller, came to India in the time of Muhammad Tughluq, was appointed Qazi of Delhi and sent on a mission to China. He has left a very valuable account of his travels and experiences.

Abdul Latif accompanied his master, Mir Abul Hasan (appointed Diwan of Bengal, 1608) from Gujrat to Bengal. In his *Safarnamah* he has left an account of the territories in the course of his journey.

There are ample materials for social and economic history of the medieval period of Indian history in the accounts of foreign travellers who visited this country during the Turko-Afghan and Mughal rule, and whose accounts have been made available to the

curious researcher and eager inquirer by the devoted labours of scholars.

(a) Turko-Afghan Period

[From Major (1857) to Mahdi Hussain (1953)]

As early as 1857 R.H. Major wrote his *India in the Fifteenth Century* containing such accounts as of Nicolo Conti, Athanasius Nikitin and others. This was followed by Yule and Cordier's editions of (i) *Cathay and the Way Thither*, 3 vols., 1866/1915-6, containing accounts of John of Monte Corvino, John De Marignolli, Friar Odoric and Ibn Batutah ; and (ii) *Travels of Marco Polo*, 2 vols. 1902/1920. Robert Sewell (*A Forgotten Empire*, 1900) gave extracts of translation from accounts of foreign travellers like Conti, Fernao Nuniz, and Domingo Paes. Mansel Longworth Dames edited *The Book of Duarte Barbosa*, 2 vols., 1918, 1921. O. Spies (*An Arab Account of India in the Fourteenth Century*) translated chapters on India from Al Qalqashindi's *Subh-ul-A'sha* (1936). The *Rehla* of Ibn Batutah (Aby Abdullah Muhammad) attracted the attention of successive scholars during the last one century. Its French translation by C. Defremery and B.R. Sanguinetti (4 vols. 1853-88) was followed by the English translations by Yule and Cordier (*Cathay and the Way Thither*, IV, 1916), by S. Lee (*The Travels of Ibn Batutah*, incomplete), and by H.A.R. Gibb [(i) *Ibn Battuta, Travels in Asia and Africa*, Broadway series and (ii) *The Travels of Ibn Battuta*, Hakluyt Society, 1958]. Recently Dr. M. Husain has edited select portions regarding India, Maldives and Ceylon along with a valuable introduction in *The Rehla of Ibn Batutah*, 1953. As regards Chinese sources of the period, W.W. Rockhill translated extracts (from Fei-Sin, Huang Sing-tsang, Ma Huan and Wang Ta. Yuan) in 1915, while extracts from the first three, relating to Bengal were translated by Dr. P.C. Bagchi.

(b) Mughal period

[From Purchas (1613) to Sen (1949)]

As compared to the Turko-Afghan period, we have a still larger number of foreign travellers during the Mughal period. These were 'a motley crowd of merchants and medicos, envoys and ecclesiastics, soldiers and sailors, fortune-hunters and adventurers of all descriptions.' Their accounts 'are of undoubted value as materials of social and economic history of seventeenth century India' (S.N. Sen). These have been edited critically with valuable notes by scholars. Most of these have been utilised by the biographers of the Great

Mughals But their comprehensive, critical and synthetic use still awaits the devoted labours of the social and economic historian of the period as a whole.

(i) *Jesuit accounts* : The value and importance of the accounts of Monserrate, Peruschi, Bartoli, Du Jarric, De Sousa and others (in Portuguese, Spanish, Italian, French and Latin languages) have been discussed by V. Smith in the bibliography of *Akbar the Great Mogul*. Full details are in the writings of Sommervogel and other recent Jesuit authors. The works of Sir E. D. Maclagan (1896), Father F. Goldie (1897) and Rev. H Hosten (1907) are highly valuable. The *Commentaries* of Father Anthony Monserrate has been edited by J.S. Hoyland and S.N. Banerjee (1922).

(ii) The accounts of European Travellers and others other than Jesuits have been edited and studied during the last three hundred fifty years. In the seventeenth century Samuel Purchas published his *Purchas his Pilgrimage* or *Relations of the World*, etc., 1613 (1st edition). Its secood edition was published twelve years later (1625), with additions, as *Purchas his Pilgrimes*. In 1669 appeared the book of Davies on Mandeslo. In the nineteenth century, Sir Roper Lethbridge published certain articles in 1870-73. These were followed by the editions of Linschoten (by Burnell and Tiele, Hakluyt, 1885, 2 vols.), Pyrard de Laval 'by Gray, 1887—90, 2 vols.), Tavernier (by Ball, 1889), Pietro Della Valle (by Crey, 1892), Fitch (by Riley, 1899), and Roe (by W. Foster. 1899).

During the twentieth century, the best edition of Purchas was published by MacLehose (1905) under the title *Hakluytus Posthumus* or *Purchas his Pilgrimages*. Thereafter volumes appeared either under the auspices of the Hakluyt Society or under individual enterprise or Indian Records Saries. Thus the Hakluyt Society went on with the editions of Thomas Bowrey (by R.C. Temple, 1905), John Jourdain (by W. Foster, 1905), John Freyer (by Crooke, 1909-15). Dharte Barbosa (by Dames, 1918—21), Manrique (by Luard and Hosten 1926-1927), *Relations of Golconda*, etc. (by W.H. Moreland, 1931), Peter Mundy (by R.C. Temple and Anste. 5 vols., 1907-36). Among other publications are those on Richard Bell and John Campbell (by R.C. Temple, *Indian Antiquary*, 1906-8), Manucci (*Storia do Mogor by* W. Irvine, 4 vols. 1907-8), Bernier (by Constable and Smith, 1914), Pelsaert (*The Remonsrtantie*, as *Jahangir's India* by Moreland and Geyl, 1925), De Laet (by Hoyland and Banerji, 1928),

Alexander Hamilton (by Sir William Foster), John Marshall (by Sir Shafaat Ahmad Khan) and Thevenot and Careri (by Sen, as *Indian Travels of* ... 1949). While Oaten wrote his *European Travellers in India* in 1909, Sir Willian Foster published his *Early Travels in India* (1921). *The Relation of an Unfortunate Voyage to the Kingdom of Bengala* by the Dutch traveller Glanius (1681, Eng. Tr. 1682) is valuable for Mir Jumla's Assam campaign. The accounts of India by French and Dutch travellers and other European travellers have not been fully utilised.

III. Archaeological

(a) Buildings, sculpture and painting, Gardens, (b) Inscriptions or epigraphic sources and (c) Coins or Numismatic sources.

Scholars of different nationalities, British, French, Dutch, Belgian, Danish, German, Russian and Indian, have attempted to study the art and architecture of medieval India either exclusively or in relation to general Muslim art, during the last one hundred years after Fergusson.

While the epigraphic and numismatic sources of this period are less important than those of the Hindu period, they are nevertheless of considerable value in fixing chronology, correcting lists and dates of kings and ascertaining the approximate extent of their kingdoms. The inscriptions of Hindu Orissa, the Deccan and South India are specially important. As early as 1882-84 Robert Sewell published his List of *Antiquarian Remains in the Presidency of Madras with a List of Inscriptions and a Sketch of the Dynasties of Southern India* (2 parts). The inscriptions have been mostly studied in *Epigraphica India, Epigraphia Indo-Moslemaica* (ed. by Horowitz and Yazdani) and other periodicals like J.A.S.B. Recently V.S. Bendrey has published the inscriptions of the *Epigraphia Indo-Moslemaica* (1907-38) with their summaries in Studies of *Muslim Inscriptions* (1944). Professor S.H. Askari and Dr. Qeamuddin Ahmad of K.P. Jayaswal Institute, Patna (and an old student of mine), have been studying the medieval insciiptions of Bihar.

In the field of numismatics, monumental studies have been made during the hundred years spanned by S. Lane Poole (1844, 1892), E. Thomas (1871), Eugene Legget (1885), C J. Rodgers (1894), G.P. Taylor (1902), O. Codrington (1904), L. White King (1904), H.N. Wright (1907-1936, 1908), R. B. Whitehead (1914 and 1934), C. J. Brown (1920), A.W. Botham, N. K. Bhattasali (1922), S. M. Hodivala

(1923) and C.N. Singhal (1935, 1952). The importance of coins as a source of this period was pointed out clearly by Lane Poole (*Catalogue of Indian Coins in the British Museum : The Sultans of Delhi*, vii) :

"As a rule we may look upon Muhammadan coins as the surest foundations for an exact history of the dynasties by which they were issued. The coins of a Muslim ruler generally go far to establish those outward data in regard to his reign which oriental historians too often neglect or mistake. The year of accession, the extent of his dominion, his relations with the neighbouring powers and with the spiritual chief of his religion are all facts for which we may look with confidence to his coins."

Thomas's *Chronicles of the Pathan Kings of Delhi*, a standard work, has been supplemented by the catalogues of coins in different museums. About the work of N.K. Bhattasali (*Coins and Chronology of the Early Independent Sultans of Bengal*), the late Sir Jadunath Sarkar recorded a wish "that well trained students of Bengal Muslim numismatics should carefully study the dates and names on the coins of the early Sultans of Bengal, of which only defective specimens are to be found in India, but much more complete and legible examples may be preserved in the coin cabinets of the British Museum and the India Office in London. Thus only can we hope to get decisive information where Dr. Nalini Kanta Bhattasali has been baffled in his reading of the coins preserved in India or has drawn wrong inferences. The new light may entail a revision of our earlier chapters."

IV. European Records

For the study of European records of the period there are monumental contributions (in English language) by David Macpherson (1782, 1805), John Bruce (1810), Frederick Charles Danvers (1888-1894), W. N. Sainsbury and his daughter Ethel Bruce Sainsbury (1907-38). The *Calendars of State Papers*, East Indies (published down to 1892) came up to 1634. This was followed by the *Court Minutes of the East India Company* from 1635-79, edited by E. B. Sainsbury (during 1907-1938). The story of initiation of British commerce with India is described in the *Letters Received by the East India Company from its Servants in the East* 1602-17 (published 1896-1902). The narrative was continued by the *English Factories in India* edited by Sir William Foster (from 1618 to 1669 in ten

vols. 1906-1927) and by Sir Charles Fawcett (from 1670 to 1677, New Series, 2 vols. 1936-52) and by Sir Patrick Cadell from 1678. C. R. Wilson has left a masterly survey of the *Early Annals of the English in Bengal* (1895-1917). *The Diary of William Hedges* (1681-87) was edited by R. Barlow and Col. H. Yule and the *New Account of the East Indies* by Capt. Alexander Hamilton (1727), by Sir William Foster, both just after two centuries of their respective compositions, while the *Diaries Streynsham Master* (1675-80) were edited by Sir Richared Carnac Temple (1911), Col Henry Davidson Love wrote his *Vestiges of Old Madras* (1640-1800), 1913.

On Portuguese activities in India and the Indian Ocean there are three general histories in English, by F. C. Danvers, K. G. Jayne and R.S Whiteaway, besides the Cambridge History of India. These rest upon mainly five Portuguese historians, viz., Joas de Barros, Diogo do Couto, Antonio Bocarro, Fernao Lopez de Castanheda and Gaspur Correa. Besides these, there are special monographs by Sir Denison Ross, M. L. Dames, J. J. A. Campos, P. E. Pieris, G. W. F. Stripling, C. R Boxer, C. H. Payne and others. Mention must be made of the eminent contributions of Pandu rang Pissurlencar of Goa.

Among the Dutch writings on South Asia are the quasi-historical Remonstrantie of Van Ravestyn and of Pelsaert (1620-26), the V.O.C. (1646), Abraham Rojernis (1651), Philippus Baldaeus (1672), Daniel Havart (1693), Francois Valentyn (1724-6), Pieter Van Dam, W. Damast Van Limberger (1757). But they mainly emphasized on Malabar, Coromandel and Ceylon. Then came William Van Geer (1895), George Nypels (1908), H. Terpstra (1918), J. Aalbers (1916), N. Macleod (1927), W. Zwier (1927), F.W. Stapel Van Leur (1934), M.A.P. Roelofsz (1943). The Dutch records are contained in the Hague Transcripts and the *Batavia Dagh Register*.

French historical writings on European activities in India began from the last quarter of 19th century, viz., H. Castonnet des Fosses (1887), Col. G. B. Malleson (1867), J. Barbier Abbe Raynal and others.

As compared to Dutch and the English, Danish historical writing is very modest. A Danish East India Company was established in 1616 but in 1732 it was reorganised as the Danish Asiatic Company. There are accounts among others of expeditions of Admiral Ove Gjedde (1618 to India), Icelander Jon Olaffson (1922 to Tranquebar),

of Adam Olearius's mission to Persia (1647), of the experiences of Frederik Bolling (1678), J.P. Cortemundo (1672-3) to the East Indies, and of the diary of Tobias Wigandt.

The factory records constitute a mine of information for political, social and economic conditions of the country. But these have not yet been fully laid under contribution. In a revealing passage Sir William Foster brings out their importance as follows :

"There are valuable details, for instance, regarding the economic state of India at this time, its chief products and manufactures, their principal centres, and the prices they commanded, the means of distribution and cost of carriage ; the weights and measures in use in various parts ; the current coinage and the mechanism of exchange by means of bills. Much light is thrown on the general condition of the country. We note the poverty and conservation of the weavers, the bad state and insecurity of the roads, the weakness of the central government, the tyranny and venality of the local officials. On the other hand we discover at times in the Emperor and his leading nobles evidences of a painstaking desire to act fairly by all and to consider the welfare of those under them ; and we have Sir Thomas Roe's declaration that 'their justice is generally good to stangers', and that many of the troubles of which the English complained loudly were caused by their own disorders. Further, there is no trace of intolerance or persecution of any man on account of his religion—a statement which could scarcely be made of any European country at the same period."

The Princess Bamba Collection of Antiquities of Sikh Period

Dr F. A. Khan*

The Princess Bamba Collection has been recently acquired by the Government of Pakistan for preservation as a national asset by the Department of Archaeology. It belonged to Maharaja Ranjit Singh, the founder of the Sikh ruling dynasty of the Punjab and his son Maharaja Dalip Singh. Most of its objects appear to have originally gone out of the Sikh Darbar in Lahore to England, where Maharaja Dalip Singh was exiled after the annexation of the Punjab by the British in 1849. The collection remained in his Suffolk home as a family treasure, which was later on inherited by his daughter, Princes Bamba Jindan, who died issueless in 1957. The collection is, therefore, of immense historical significance as it throws ample light on the life and time of Maharaja Ranjit Singh, his son Maharaja Dalip Singh and the Sikh Darbar in Lahore. It also reveals a distinct artistic taste of the Sikh royal princes during the turbulent period of the mid-19th century Punjab.

Although, Sikhism was born as a result of a great wave of spiritual awakening during the 15th century in the areas now called West Pakistan, the growth of Sikh political power in the Punjab and the North Western regions in the beginning of the 19th century, deserves a critical appreciation for understanding the implication of the regional cultures. The founder of Sikhism, Guru Nanak, was born at a village named Talwandi (modern Nankana Sahib) near Lahore. He preached against idolatory, caste distinction and hypocricy, and gave his followers a comprehensive ethical code. A close study of the events connected with the lives of his religious successors—the Gurus—will reveal how deeply they were associated with Pakistan. The presence of over 130 shrines dedicated to different Gurus, situated in the

* Dr F. A. Khan, T. Pk., Director of Archaeology in Pakistan, Lahore—Catalogue of *The Princess Bamba Collection* (Antiquities of Sikh Period), pub. Department of Archaeology, Ministry of Education & Scientific Research, Government of Pakistan, Lahore, 1961.

length and breadth of West Pakistan, bear testimony to their close and continuous contact with this area during the centuries following the death of their founder.

Guru Nanak had emphasised that fundamental truth underlines all religions and the chief features of his system were its 'non-sectarian character and its harmony with secular life.' The early Gurus were religious preachers and did not interfere in politics; but later on, their conflicts started with the Mughal emperors, and after the death of Emperor Aurangzeb, the Sikhs under the leadership of their religious leaders over-ran the provinces of Sirhind and Delhi. The 18th century was, thus, a period of political upheaval in the Punjab. The death of the last Guru Gobind Singh in 1708 brought the institution of Guruship to an end. He, however, entrusted the secular affairs of the Sikhs to Lachman Das, a Hindu Pandit, who was re-named Banda Bahadur and who returned to the Punjab from Deccan with Guru Gobind Singh's banner, his battle drum and five arrows and spent most of his time in fighting the Mughal forces of Emperors Bahadur Shah and Farukhsiyar.

With Banda's death in 1716 the political power of the Sikhs came to a steep decline. The religious affairs were entrusted to Bhai Mani Singh with the backing of the faction led by the widow of Guru Gobind Singh. At the same time, the Mughal power had also started showing signs of disintegration. The Marathas were consolidating their position and the Jats were in open revolt around the capital itself. The prevailing political anarchy was aggravated by the successive invasions of Nadir Shah in 1738 and Ahmad Shah Abdali from 1748 to 1767. These invasions helped the Sikhs to establish their rule in the Punjab over the area extending from Rawalpindi to the bank of Jamna in the east and up to Thar desert in the south. But the internal conflicts augmented the different Sikh factions and hostilities of the Afghans, the Dogras, the Gurkhas, the Marathas and the English created great obstacles in the establishment of a stable Sikh Government.

Out of this chaos Maharaja Ranjit Singh, by dint of his chivalry and statesmanship, consolidated a powerful kingdom on the north-west of the Sutlej, at the beginning of the nineteenth century. This he did by strengthening both his political and military power. The inhabitants of the Punjab, irrespective of caste or creed, were associated with his Government. His army consisted of the Sikh, Gurkha, Panjabi Musalman and Pathan soldiers. European officers, at one

time, nearly three dozen were employed to organize and train the troops. The highly placed foreign officers in his service were French Generals Ventura, Allard and Court; Avitabile, an Italian, and Colonel Gardner an Irishman, who commanded his cavalry infantry and artillery. These officers can be seen in the painting depicting the Darbar of Maharaja Ranjit Singh (S. No. 1). It is very strange that none of the European officers fought on the Sikh side in the Anglo-Sikh wars, and in fact many volunteered for service in the English army. Canons were manufactured in Lahore and Muslim gunners were trained to handle them. Maharaja Ranjit Singh had several able councillors; these included Fakir Sayed Noor-ud-din and Fakir Sayed Aziz-ud-din. (The Fakirs and the European officers also appear in S. No. 58.)

Maharaja Ranjit Singh died in 1839 without nominating his successor. As he had no time to found any permanent institutions which could live apart from himself, his death was the signal for the beginning of fight for power. The Sikh throne was successively occupied by his eldest son Maharaja Kharak Singh who died in 1840, his grandsons Maharaja Naunihal Singh (d. 1840) and his second son Maharaja Sher Singh (d. 1843) who were all murdered one after the other by rival factions. In the year 1843, Maharaja Ranjit Singh's son Prince Dalip Singh by Rani Jind Kaur, commonly known as Rani Jindan, ascended the throne at the age of six. Rani Jindan was the daughter of Sirdar Manna Singh Aulakh of Chauganwan (S. No. 3). The Anglo-Sikh wars resulted in ultimate liquidation of the Sikh power, and on 30th March, 1849, Maharaja Ranjit Singh's short lived kingdom was annexed by the British. Maharaja Dalip Singh was taken away to Fatehgarh in the U. P., and put under the tutelage of Sir John Login of the Bengal Army, with the result that after two years the young Maharaja expressed a desire to renounce his faith and embrace Christianity. He was baptised, granted a pension, sent to England and given an estate in Suffolk. He married Bamba Muller, daughter of a European merchant and an Abyssinian mother. The marriage took place in the British Consulate at Alexandria, Egypt.

Maharani Bamba spoke and understood only Arabic, and in the beginning the Maharaja had amusing difficulties when attempting to converse with his fiancee. She bore him Prince Victor Dalip Singh (b. 1866, d. 1918), Prince Fredrick Dalip Singh (b. 1886, d. 1926), Princess Bamba Jindan (b. 1869, d. 1957), Princess Katherine (b. 1871), Prince Albert Edward Dalip Singh (b. 1879, d. 1893) and Princess So-

phia Alexandra (b. 1874, d. 1948). The children of Maharaja Dalip Singh died issueless. Dalip Singh came to India twice and was reconverted to his paternal faith. In 1886 he made an attempt to leave England for good and settle down in the Punjab, but his attempt failed and he was not allowed to proceed beyond Aden. He did not return to England and died in Paris in 1893.

Princess Bamba Jindan Dalip Singh, who later on married an English gentleman Dr. Southerland, continued to keep in her custody the collection of paintings and objects of arts, belonging to her father. She died in Lahore on March 10, 1957, without having any issue and, thus, with her death ended the line of the Sikh ruling dynasty. She bequeathed the collection to Pir Karim Bakhsh Supra of Lahore who sold it recently to the Government of Pakistan.

The collection consists of 18 oil paintings, 14 water colours, 22 ivory paintings, 17 photographs, 10 metallic objects and 7 miscellaneous articles.

The paintings in this collection are mostly the work of European artists, and therefore, they do not belong to the style of painting which was in vogue in the Punjab during the Sikh period and which resembled broadly the Kangra School. A number of paintings of that period are in the Central Museum, Lahore. There are also panels of wall paintings in the *Samadhi* of Maharaja Ranjit Singh; in the *Haveli* of Maharaja Naunihal Singh in Lahore and on the walls of the Mirs' Harem in the Hyderabad Fort. In the Lahore Fort, the Department of Archaeology has traced a number of wall paintings of the Sikh period which were concealed under lime plaster of the British period. These paintings provide interesting material for a study of the Sikh period art.

The majority of paintings of the Bamba collection are, thus, the work of European painters: August Schoefft, Leslie Poole Smith, Goldingham, Blakeney Ward, P.C. French, Paillet and Winterhalter, and represent the style in vogue in Europe in the 19th century. The painting illustrating the 'Darbar of Maharaja Ranjit Singh' by August Schoefft (No. 1) deserves special consideration on account of the unusually large size of the canvas, 192" × 100", and the minute details of the Sikh Court. The scene depicts Maharaja Ranjit Singh dressed in plain white clothes seated with all the glory of the royal Darbar. The paintings showing 'Maharaja Ranjit Singh' at Amritsar (No. 2) and 'Maharaja Sher Singh in Council' (No. 5) give a glimpse into their unsophisticated life. The portraits of Maharaja Sher Singh (No. 4),

the Mughal Emperor Bahadur Shah (No. 11) and his sons (No. 12 and 13), the Maharaja Dalip Singh (No. 8) depict in the minutest detail the richness of the costumes and jewels worn by them.

Among the water colours, the painting of Maharaja Dalip Singh (No. 45) deserves special attention on account of its details and overall grace and charming effect which it produces. It was commissioned by Queen Victoria and painted in the Buckingham Palace by Winterhalter.

The twenty-two oval ivory miniatures are in the style prevalent in Delhi, Agra and Benaras in the 19th century (S. Nos. 19-40). The photographs of Anne Dalip Singh and the sons of Maharaja Dalip Singh are valuable historical record.

Among silver objects, the model of Maharaja Ranjit Singh riding-in-state on an elephant (L. 23", B. 23", H. 44"), is exquisitely finished. The inscription on the silver cup presented to Princess Sophia Dalip Singh (S. No. 78) reflects the sentiments of love and affection of the Sikhs, which they had for their ruling family.

The horse trappings set with gold and precious stones, and the gold plated umbrella give an idea of the wealth of the Sikh Court (No. 81).

The plaster cast of the marble bust of Maharaja Dalip Singh (No. 86) made under orders of Queen Victoria by Baron Marochetti, is a fine specimen of statuary. The original is in the Buckingham Palace.

The *Arzdasht* in Persian by Rai Kanahiya Lall, author of *Zafar Nama Ranjit Singh*, presenting a copy of his work to Maharaja Dalip Singh, demonstrates how the Persian language enjoyed the patronage in the Sikh Court. (S. No. 87.)

The present collection, in short, contains a number of paintings and other miscellaneous objects which have a direct bearing on the house of Maharaja Ranjit Singh and his son Dalip Singh, and their return from the U. K. to their original homeland will be a valuable addition to the art treasure of Pakistan.

We are indeed very grateful to Pir Karim Bakhsh Supra whose keen interest in the preservation for our cultural heritage and whose desire that the collection should not go out of Pakistan, enabled us to acquire these relics.

Oil Paintings

1. Durbar of Maharaja Ranjit Singh (C. 1838)
Canvas, 192" × 100", by Aug. Schoefft.

Maharaja Ranjit Singh seen sitting in the marble pavilion adjoining the Sishmahal in the Lahore Fort and receiving *nazrana*. Members of the Royal Family, nobility and high officials of the state including European Military Officers surrounding him. This was on display in the British Museum.

2. *Maharaja Ranjit Singh at Amritsar*
   Canvas, 4′×8½″×3′-7″, by Aug. Schoefft.

   The scene depicts the Maharaja seated on a red velvet cushion at the side of Golden Temple. In front of the Maharaja stands an attendant holding umbrella. On the left are seated three long bearded persons reciting the *Granth Sahib* which is placed on high velvet cushions. In the background are a number of buildings. In the middle of the tank stands the Golden Temple connected with a causeway.

3. *Maharani Jindan* — Canvas, 4′-8″×3′-9″.

   Seated on a thick round cushion in red cloth woven in gold having dark green velvet borders. The Maharani is depicted reclining against a big pillow; inside Lahore Fort.

4. *Maharaja Sher Singh*, D. 1843, Portrait.
   Canvas, 4′-8″×3′-8½″ by Aug. Schoefft.

   (Son of Maharaja Ranjit Singh—occupied the throne of Lahore after the death of Naunihal Singh in 1840 and was murdered by Sandhawalias in 1843.)

5. *Maharaja Sher Singh in Council*—Canvas, 2′×18″, by Aug. Schoefft.

   Seated on a cushion on ground with his Prime Minister Dhian Singh Dogra and other Sirdars who have been depicted seated in two rows on his right and left side.

6. *H. H. Maharaja Dalip Singh*, G.C.S.I., B. 1838, D. 1893. Canvas, 4′-6″×6′-6″.
   Portrait by Capt. Goldingham. In an elaborately carved gilded wooden frame.

7. *Prince Dalip Singh* — On horse back, in red and gilt frame.
   Canvas, 2′-6½″×2′-2½″.

8. *Prince Dalip Singh* — Canvas, 4′-5″×3′-9″. Portrait, in elaborate gilt frame.

9. *Fredrick Dalip Singh* — B. 1868 aged 3.
   4′-8″×3′-5½″, by Aug. Schoefft. In scarlet clothes embroidered

with gold, wearing Salim Shahi shoes. Has a sword in hand, Badshahi Mosque, Lahore, can be seen in the distant back ground.

10. *Maj. H. H. Prince F. Dalip Singh, MVO, Norfolk Yeomanry* ; Canvas, 5'-6" × 3'-6". Portrait by Leslie Poole Smith 1909.
11. *Emperor Bahadur Shah, the last king of Delhi* — B. 1776, D. 1862. Canvas, 5'-0" × 3'-6". Portrait by Aug. Schoefft.
12. *One of the sons of Emperor Bahadur Shah* — Canvas, 4'-0" × 3'-3", by Aug. Schoefft.
13. *Mirza (Shahzada) Jawan Bakht* — The Youngest son of Emperor Bahadur Shah. Canvas, 4' × 3'-3".
14. *Delhi*—Canvas, 3'-0" × 2'-6" by Aug. Schoefft.
15. *Banaras*—Canvas, 4'-6" × 3'-6", by Aug. Schoefft. River Scene.
16. *Palace Scene*—Canvas, 4'-6" × 3'-6", Depicting figures on a roof in the foreground and a group of buildings round the tank.
17. *Land Scape* — Framed, 1'-9½" × 1'-5½", Sheep in foreground—a red coloured building in centre.
18. *Land Scape*—Framed, 2'-4" × 1'-11", A fountain in the centre.

Ivory Paintings

19. *'Goolab Sing'*
20. *'Rhmcirk'*
21. *'Sall Sing'*
22. *'Dhian Sing'*
23. *'Teja Sing'*
24. *'Ahakbar Sing'*
25. *'Sheare Sing' (Sher)*
26. *'Dewan Moohag'*
27. *'Rannee Jindah' (Rani)*
28. *'Shear Sing Uttarrywalla'*
29. *'Runjeet Sing'*
30. *'Dost Mohammad Khan'*
31. *'Newhal Sing' (Naunihal Singh)*
32. *'Checha Sing'*
33. *'Duleep Sing'*
34. *'Rumbar Sing'*
35. *'Chutter Sing Uttareywala'*
36. *'Huree Singh' (Hari)*
37. *'Sham Singh Uttareywala'*
38. *'Deena Naut' (Nath)*
39. *'Shulla Mur Garden', Lahore (Shalimar)*
40. *Tarj, Agra (Taj Mahal, Agra)*.

Note :—The twenty-two oval shaped Ivory paintings (No. 19-40) are by an unidentified artist of the Punjab. These arranged in 6 rows having 4 paintings in 5 rows and two paintings in the sixth bottom row. The painting from right to left—starting from row No. 1 to 6 depict the persons, mentioned above—spellings of names have been copied as they appear under each painting.

Water Colour Paintings

41. *Maharaja Ranjit Singh* — Bust, 10″ × 8″.

42. *Maharaja Ranjit Singh* —
Bust, 10½″ × 8½″ on drawing paper (same as 41 above) ordinary frame without glasses.

43. *Maharaja Dalip Singh — Lahore 1849*
1′-6-½″ × 1′-4″, seated on a chair and surrounded by four attendants.

44. *Maharaja Dalip Singh — Mussoori, 1853.* Seated on horse back.
1′-9″ × 1′-5½″, by P. C. French.

45. *Maharaja Dalip Singh*
2′-2″ × 1′-2″, by Paillet wearing princely dress, holding a sword in right hand and belt by the left.

46. *Maharaja Dalip Singh* — 2′-5½″ × 1′-8″, by Winterhalter (No. 45).

47. *Maharaja Dalip Singh* — 2′-9″ × 2′-0″, with footnote at base—'to my dear friend George Bartley' (copy of No. 45).

48. *Fredrick Dalip Singh* — 3′-1″ × 2′-8″, by Blakeny Ward.

49. *A Mughal Court* —
2′-5″ × 1′-11″, King seated on a golden throne, nobles standing in rows on his left and right.

50. *Land Scape* — 2′-3½″ × 1′-9″
51. *Land Scape* — 2′-3½″ × 1′-9″
52. *Land Scape* — 1′-7½″ × 1′-3″
53. *Land Scape* — 1′-10″ × 6′½″
54. *Land Scape* — 10½″ × 8½″

Photographs

55. *Maharaja Ranjit Singh* —
1′-7″ × 1′-3½″, Photographs of a pencil sketch in glazed frame.

56. *Maharaja Ranjit Singh* — Wooden frame on horse back with three lance bearers in front and one umbrella bearer in the rear, 1′-1″ × 10″.

57. *Maharaja Ranjit Singh* — on horse back.
The photograph has been printed by placing the negative in reverse.

58. *Court of Maharaja Ranjit Singh (Lahore)* —
2′-2″ × 2′-2″, Photograph of painting by Mohd. Bakhsh *Nakāsh*,

Chhuta Bazar, Lahore, drawn in 1880. Depicting following nobles of his Darbar.

Left side : Kharak Singh, Sher Singh, Naunihal Singh, Peshawara Singh, Kashmira Singh, Hira Singh, Diwan Dina Nath, accountant and attendants

Right side : 1st row Raja Dhian Singh, Raja Gulab Singh, Sardar Hari Singh Nalwa, Raja Sochet Singh, Nidhan Singh, Sardar Ajit Singh, Sardar Lehna Singh, Dhowkal Singh.

2nd row Faqir Nooruddin (Secretary), Jemadar Khushal Singh, Raja La' Singh (Misser), Mr. Allard (French), Sardar Sham Singh Atariwala, Diwan Ajudhia Parshad, Sultan Mohd. Khan of Kabul, Makhe Khan, Phoola Singh Nihang.

3rd row Faqir Azizuddin (Secretary), Sardar Lehna Singh Majithia, Shaikh Ghulam Mohiuddin; (Mr.) Ventura (Italian), Sardar Attar Singh Kalianwala, Nawab Sarfraz Khan, Diwan Sawan Mal, Sardar Chattar Singh Atariwala.

59. *Court of Maharaja Ranjit Singh* — Framed 2′-8½″ × 1′-9″, Photograph of painting No. 1 above.

60. *Ranjit Singh—Tomb at Lahore* — Framed 1′-3½″ × 1′7½″.

61. *Maharaja Sher Singh* — Framed 1′-8½″ × 1′-3½″. Photograph of a pencil portrait.

62. *Prince Dalip Singh*—Framed 1′-3″ × 1′-1″. Painted in opaque glass.

63. *Anne Dalip Singh—1900* — Framed 1′-9″ × 1′-3″ (Wife of Victor Dalip Singh).

64. *Victor Dalip Singh—1892* — Framed 14″ × 9½″. Autographed photograph of Victor Dalip Singh, eldest son of Dalip Singh, D. 1918.

65. *Fredrick Dalip Singh—Freddy, 1895'* — Framed 1′-8½″ × 1′-4″.

66. *Fredrick Dalip Singh—1898* — Framed 1′-8″ × 1′-2½″, dressed in princely attire.

67. *Fredrick Dalip Singh* — Framed 1′-8″ × 1′-2″. Standing, wearing princely dress. The photograph has been painted in water colour.

68. *Princess Bamba* — Framed 1′-9″ × 1′-4″, Wearing court dress.

69. *Bust of a Boy with Navy Scarf* — Framed 1′-9″ × 1′-5″.

70. *Bust of a Male in Uniform* — Framed 2′-8½″ × 1′-9″.

71. *Maharaja Ranjit Singh*—Pedestal 2′-8″ × 1′-11″, Total Height 44″

On a Caprisoned Elephant, Silver, set on a 12″ high oblong pedestal depicting Sikh Soldiers; two with exquisitely modelled

horses, two with Guns, an ascetic seated on the ground and a hunt ing dog. The Maharaja is shown seated on the elephant on a delicately made *Hauda* with an attendent sitting behind and holding an umbrella over him.

The plinth is beautifully decorated on all sides. The front depicts a deer being attracked by a man on right and a leopard on the left; the back side panel shows a lioness pouncing upon a fallen horse whose rider with a Sword and Shield is attacking the beast. The right side panel depicts a hunting procession of footmen, mounted horses, camels and elephants. The left side panel depicts a scene outside the Lahore Fort, showing Sikhs, Europeans and an army battalion.

72. *Umbrella of Ranjit Singh* — Dia. 6' with a gold plated (thin metal) Pole length 8'-11".
The umbrella in red cloth inter-woven with gold; with golden plated Spokes, connected with the central cogwheel.
73. *Fly Whisk*—Size of handle 12" with silver handle beautifully carved.
74. *Fly Whisk*—Size of handle 12" with silver handle.
75. *Fly Whisk*—Size of handle 1'-5" with silver handle.
76. *Fly Whisk*—Size of handle 1'-4½", with silver handle.
77. *Cylinderical Case* — Silver, L. 13', Dia. 1'-5", by Rai Kanhayallal, author of *Zafarnama-i-Ranjit Singh* with an address in persian addressed to Maharaja Dalip Singh.
78. *Cup* — Silver plain, H. 5", Dia. 6½"
with two earshaped handles; a square low pedestal and following inscriptions :
"Presented to "Her Highness Princess Sophia Dalip Singh by the Sikh soldiers of the Indian Convalescent Home, Barton-on-Sea, Jan. 1916."
79. *Alter Candle Stick Stand* — Brass, H. 1'-9", with a nail on top. Dia. at top 7½", at the base 2'-2½". Said to belong to Maharaja Ranjit Singh.
80. *Alter Candle Stick Stand* —Brass, H. 1'-9" with a nail on top. Dia. at the top 7½", at the base 2'-2½". Said to belong to Maharaja Ranjit Singh.

Miscellaneous

81. *Horse Trappings of Maharaja Ranjit Singh*
in three pieces (i) Sar Band; (ii) Seena Band and (iii) Dum Gazz (tail strap) covered with red velvet richly covered with gold

decorations and studdied with diamonds rubies, jaspers.

(i) *Sar Band* :
set with 77 small and 6 medium size flowers, in plate gold, with eight petals, each petal studdied with turquoise; a *tika* weight 10 tolas of gold with ten pendents of 100 Kt. One *Kalgi* and two solid gold buckle. The *Tika* and *Kalgi* are richly studded with jewels.

(ii) *Seena Band* :
Total length 4'-11" with 35 small and 2 medium size flowers of plate gold weighing 20 tolas. Each flower has eight petals studdied with 14 turquoise and a diamond; a medallion of 10 tolas of gold set with a large piece of turquoise and other small beads of stones.

(iii) *Dum Gazz (Tail)* :
Total length 5'-6" with 64 small flowers of plate gold weight 32 tolas; two medium size and one big buckle of solid gold weighing 2 tolas and 10 tolas respectively; studded with jewels and precious and semi precious stones.

82. *Pedigree of Maharaja Dalip Singh Chandar Bansi*
Framed 2'-5" × 2'-0" — Jadave Bhargavya Goter of the Punjab.

83. *Hands reposing against breast*—Marble 1'-3 × 7½".
Said to represent the hand of Mai Jindan—wife of Maharaja Ranjit Singh.

84. *Plaster Cast* — of No. 83 above.

85. *Low Seat Chair* — Lacquer work—seat 1'-6" × 1'-6", H. 2'-7".
Wooden back decorated with 2 peacocks on the top and 2 standing female figures and a male playing flute.

86. *Bust of Dalip Singh* — 2'-5" including pedestal.
Plaster cast of marble bust of H. H. the Maharaja Dalip Singh at the age of 18, by Baron Marochetti. The original is at Buckingham Palace and duplicate at Blottorton Hall, Norfolk Sophia Dalip Singh owned the present piece.

87. *Arzdasht*
in Persian, by Rai Kanahiyalal, author of *Zafar Nama-i-Ranjit Singh* 29½" × 11½".
Presenting a copy of his work to Prince Dalip Singh. The text has been written in elegant *Nastaliq* with a floral designed margin in azure, green, red, gold and turquoise blue with a beautifully executed *Peshani* in Kashmir Style.
The space in between the lines of the text has been decorated with floral bands in gold work. (See Annex. I in the Catalogue.)

Annals of the Ramgarhia Sardars*

SARDAR SUNDAR SINGH RAMGARHIA

Introduction

It is from the first decade of the eighteenth century that we take up the thread of our narrative. Guru Gobind Singh having established the Brotherhood of Lions [the Singhs] had gone back to Heaven leaving the infant *Khalsa* surrounded by blood-thirsty foes. He had promised to lend a helping and guiding hand from above. But the helpless children of the faith, seeing no visible hand to support them, trusted all their welfare to the leadership of Banda Singh. Upon this great leader and warrior the Guru had bestowed his blessings, and had received in return many sacred pledges, Banda Singh promising to abide by the Guru's injuctions. He proved a good nurse to the young Lion-Cubs and avenged the murder of the two younger sons of the Guru who were mercilessly killed at Sirhind by the tyrant Mugal [Nawab Wazir Khan]. The infant Khalsa soon grew to boyhood and learnt the use of its limbs. It was at this time that the following twelve Misls (confedracies) were formed.

(1) First and the greatest the Bhangi Misl ruled over a vast tract, the revenues of which were a little over a crore of Rupees. The Misl had 12,000 horsemen.

(2) The Ramgarhia Misl, exercised absolute sway over territories the maximum revenue of which was between four and five millions of Rupees. The Misl possessed 360 forts and an army of 10,000 horsemen. Many Rajas and Nawabs paid tribute to it.

(3) Kanhaiya Misl, had 8,000 fighting men.

(4) Ahluwalia Misl, the Raja of Kapurthala is its present representative.

(5) Phul Misl, the three ruling Chiefs of Patiala, Nabha and Jind are the descendants of this Misl and rule under British protection over territories conquered by their ancestors.

(6) Sukarchakian Misl, from this Misl rose the Great Maharaja Ranjit Singh, *the Lion of the Punjab*, who conquered many of the Misls.

(7) Karoria Misl, had 12,000 fighting men.

---

* Published by the author at Amritsar, 1902.

(8) Daleywalian Misl, had 7,500 fighting men.
(9) Nishanawalian (Banner bearer) Misl, had 12,000 followers.
(10) Fayzulapurian Misl, its descendants are still great Sirdars.
(11) Shahidan (Martyrs) Misl, had 2,000 horsemen.
(12) Nakaian Misl, had 2,000 horsemen.

Rome was not built in a day. So the organisation of the Sikh power in the sacred land of the five rivers was not the work of one man (the Lion of the Punjab) only, nor was it attained in one day. It was the result of the constant and combined efforts of the twelve Misls. The leadears of these Misls had to undergo and face many hardships, not only to establish the Sikh power in the Punjab but also to defend their faith and their very existence upon the face of the earth. The seed was sown and watered by the blood of martyrs. Our nerves tingle and our brains throb when we read the stories of these heroes. No religion can be proud of so many martyrs. But it was Ranjit only who was destined to reap the main harvest which had taken nearly a century to ripen and had cost the blood of the dearest sons of the Guru. By some means or other he reduced all the chiefs to subjection who were on this side of the Satluj. The Cis-Satluj chiefs obtained the protection of the British and thus escaped destruction. The reader will find in the following pages how sudden and extraordinary were the circumstances that changed the fate of the Ramgarhia family. Had it time to appeal to the British Government, this family also would have been ruling over its possessions like its contemporaries of Patiala, Nabha, Jind and Kapurthala. Reader ! it is really very pathetic to compare the present condition of the family with its past grandeur. Time are changed, new men have come to the front, some no doubt pushed forward merely by fortune and others drawn to the front by the extended hands of appreciation. Let us thank the Almighty that we are under the benign rule of a Government which has the best regard for, and appreciation of, noble blood and high birth, of which the recent establishment of the Imperial Cadet Corps by our worthy Viceroy Lord Curzon, bears ample testimony.

I

Of the leaders of the Ramgarhia *Misl* during the earliest period of its existence Sirdar Jassa Singh was the most distinguished, although he can hardly be called its founder. Through many eventful years the *Misl* had existed as an organised body under Sirdar Khushal Singh.

Har Dass, the grandfather of Sardar Jassa Singh, was a resident of Sur-Singh, a large village in the Lahore district. He took *Pahul* (the Sikh baptism) from the hands of Guru Govind Singh Ji himself and leaving the plough became one of his personal attendants. After the death of the Guru he joined the following of Banda and took part in almost every religious battle under his flag against the Mugal Empire. In 1716 A. D. he died in a skirmish. After him his son Sirdar Bhagwan Singh became the head of the family, and with 200 followers entered the Imperial forces under the Governor of Lahore. Owing to his ability he rose to be a distinguished officer. He died fighting for his master in 1739 at Lahore, when Nadar Shah invaded India and the Governor resisted him ineffectually. He had five sons. Sirdar Jassa Singh, the eldest, now became the head of the family. He was appointed a Risaldar by the Imperial Governor of Lahore, and the following villages were given to him in *jagir* :

Valla, Verka, Sultanwind, Tung, and Chabba (all of these are now in the Amritsar district). On the death of Khan Bahadur the Governor of Lahore, in 1746, Sirdar Jassa Singh, together with his followers, joined his Sikh bretheren at Amritsar.

At this time the celebrated Adina Beg, the Imperial Governor of the Jullundur Doab, exercised great influence in the Punjab. As there was constant quarrelling between him and the Sikhs, Sirdar Jassa Singh was sent to him as their ambassador by the Sikhs, who considered the Sirdar one of the ablest men among themselves From all accounts Sirdar Jassa Singh was a tall handsome young man, possessing rare intellectual qualities. The Nawab was so pleased with him that he granted all the demands of the Sikhs, to plead for which Sirdar Jassa Singh had been sent. Moreover, Adina Beg took him and his brothers into his service and made him the Tahsildar over a large district. He remained for a long time in the service of the Nawab.

When Prince Timur, son of Ahmad Shah, marched against Adina Beg, the latter retreated towards the hills to the north and Sirdar Jassa Singh and his brothers left him and went to Amritsar, where they joined the forces of Nand Singh Sanghania. The younger brother of Sirdar Jassa Singh was at this time killed in action with the Afgans near Majitha. After the terrible blow dealt to the Sikhs by Ahmad Shah, in the Battle of *Ghulu Ghara*, in which 17,000 Sikhs fell, the three brothers, Jassa Singh, Mali Singh and Tara Singh, with Jai Singh Kanhaiya, were reduced to the necessity of hiding in jungles and subsisting on whatever chance threw in their

way. They had, however, the temerity to visit Amritsar to bathe in the sacred tank, and pillaged the suburbs of the city. When attacked by the Shah's troops they fired off their matchlocks and fled to the jungles. After the departure of Ahmad Shah, Jassa Singh with his brothers Mali Singh and Tara Singh, and Jai Singh Kanhaiya emerged from their jungle retreat, and collecting their followers ravaged the country far and wide, building forts and establishing military outposts. When Khawaja Obed, the Governor of Lahore, attacked the Sikh fort at Gujranwala, he was opposed by the united forces of the Ramgarhias and Kanhaiya and the guns, ammunition and treasure left by the Governor were equally divided by the leaders of the two *Misls.*

The Afghan prince and his guardian, seeing that all their attempts to disperse the Sikhs had failed, and that the number of the insurgents was daily increasing by thousands, and realising that the forces at their own disposal, however well armed and disciplined, were not strong enough to stand before them, considered it prudent to evacuate Lahore and retire towards the Chenab. They retreated in the night, unknown even to their own Hindustani troops, whom they distrusted, and in such haste that the royal family fell into the hands of the enemy, though they were subsequently released. This took place about the middle of 1758. The triumphant Sikhs occupied Lahore under their celebrated leaders, Sirdar Jassa Singh Ahluwalia and the Ramgarhia Sirdar of that name. Thus the Sikhs became for the first time masters of Lahore.

On the departure of Ahmad Shah from India in 1757 and the return of Adina Beg Khan from his hill retreat, the latter made a vow to extiropate the Sikhs who had become very troublesome, making common cause against Mussalmans. The Marhattas, who at this time swept over the Punjab, elevated Adina Beg Khan to the Viceroyalty of Lahore. The new Viceroy after reducing Kutab Shah, the Rohilla chief, laid siege to Batala and captured it. Mir Aziz Bakhsh, in command of a strong body of cavalry, was sent to Majha country with orders to attack and chastise the Sikhs wherever they could be found. Four thousand pioneers accompanied the Mir with sharpened tools for the purpose of clearing the jungle where the Sikhs had concealed themselves. Thousands of Sikhs were hunted down and mercilessly butchered. Some of them fled to Amritsar. This town was at this time nothing more than a large village, and Sirdar Jassa Singh partially fortified it surrounding a portion with a

high mud wall, which they called Ram Rouni. Sirdar Jassa Singh and his friends, on being besieged here, fought gallantly, and made more than one sally from the fort ; but they were overmatched and at length abandoned it at night, and cut their way through the enemy with considerable loss. The Ram Rouni was dismantled, but Adina Beg died shortly afterwards, and Jassa Singh taking command of the confederacy, rebuilt the fort he had defended so bravely, named it Ramgarh and his *Misl* the Ramgarhia. He seized at this time, aided by the Kanhaiya *Misl*, a wide tract comprising Dinanagar, Batala, Kalanour, Siri Hargovindpur, Kadian, Ghumman and many other places in the Amritsar and Gurdaspur districts. The revenue of the possessions was estimated at from 6 to 10 lacs of rupees. Besides this Sirdar Jassa Singh, who was the sole lord of the territory, acquired many villages in the Jullundur Doab. He also attacked and subdued the Rajas of Jaswal, Anarpur, Dipalpur, Chumba, Haripur and Katoch, and got a promise of 3 lacs of Rupees as an annual tribute from them, and built a fort at Harnala on the banks of Ravi and put his brother Mali Singh with 4,000 horsemen in charge of it. To his other brothers he gave separate *jagirs*.

In 1761 when the war, which culminated in the battle of Panipat, was going on between Marhattas and Afghans, all the Sikh Sirdars taking advantage of the opportunity joined together and marched against Lahore. Amir Muhammad Khan, the Naib-Subedar, shut himself up in the city. The Sikhs surrounded the town on all sides and demanded a heavy sum of money for *Karah Parshad*. Rs. 30,000 were offered to them, which they accepted and raised the seige.

The young Afghan prince and his *Wazir* Jahan Khan now devoted their attention to checking the increasing audacity of the Sikhs. Their stronghold at Amritsar called the Ram Rouni was attacked and levelled to the ground ; the sacred reservoir (in which stands the Golden Temple) was filled up and all their places of worship were defiled. This outrage on the sacred City of the Khalsa roused the whole Sikh nation, and they assembled in great force, determined to defend their religion with the sword. They ravaged the whole country around Lahore, which simply swarmed with Sikh horsemen. Jahan Khan came out against them and succeeded at first in dispersing them. The Sikhs, however, assembled in larger numbers, and were now strong not only to cut off communication between the fort and the country, but also to collect the revenues of the area around Lahore and dispose of it as they liked.

The matter came to a head when the Pathans were strong enough to offer battle again. A very severe fight took place, a great number of Pathans fell and the rest fled. The sacred tank of Amritsar, which had been filled up by Timur Shah, was again cleared out and the task of taking out the rubbish and filth from the sacred pool was forced upon the Afghans. In 1763 after Ahmad Shah had retired from the Punjab having totally defeated the Sikhs near Ludhiana and destroyed the holy temples at Amritsar, Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia, in alliance with Sirdar Jassa Singh Ahluwalia and Hari Singh Bhangi, attacked the Pathan town of Kasur, which they captured and sacked after a month's siege Sirdar Jassa Singh was with the Sikhs in the great battle of Sirhind in which Zen Khan was defeated and slain, and got many horses and camels as his share of the loot. Kutab Khan, who was sent by the Mugal Emperor with 20,000 troops to punish the Sikhs, was defeated and slain by them at Phillour. His camp was plundered by the Sikhs. Sirdar Jassa Singh among many other things got 150 horses and one elephant.

One of the main causes of the inability of Khalsa leaders to derive enduring benefit from their military power was mutual jealousies. There was a bitter feud between the two most powerful families, *viz.*, the Ramgarhia and the Ahluwalia because the territories of the two Misls were contiguous, and also for the following reason. All the Sikhs forces on one occasion joined together and with a united army 60 or 70 thousand strong marched against Delhi. The Mugal empire was at its last gasp, and so no one opposed them. The Sikhs plundered the city, and burnt a great part of it. Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia as well as Ahluwalia and many other Sirdars penetrated into the Fort. Here some of the followers of Sirdar Jassa Singh Ahluwalia made him sit on the imperial throne and proclaimed him king. Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia, and many other Sirdars who did not consider themselves in any way inferior to him, were very much annoyed by this action. Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia, with many other things brought a piece of stone (length 6 ft. 3 inches, breadth 4 ft. 6 inches, thickness 9 inches) upon which the King used to sit and which was used as a sort of coronation stone. It was the identical slab on which the Ahluwalia chief had been made to sit and proclaimed king. This historic stone was afterwards set in the front part of the Ramgarhia Bunga where it still exists. Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia's vow is fulfilled, because it is used as a throne for the Holy Granth Sahib, the everlasting guide and

the immortal king of the Khalsa nation.

Once upon a time when Sirdar Jassa Singh Ahluwalia was passing near Gurdaspur on his way to Achal, he was attacked by Sirdar Khushal Singh, Mali Singh, and Tara Singh, younger brothers of Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia. His troops were dispersed and he was taken prisoner.

The Ramgarhia chief, however, released him with rich gifts when he was brought before him as a prisoner for the old Sikh barons had much of the spirit of chivalry in them. But the Ahluwalia cheiftain swore a mighty oath that he would never take off his turban till he had not seized all the Ramgarhia estates. Many chiefs came to help him, incited by the prospect of plundering a new jagir. There were Ganda Singh and Jhanda Singh Bhangis, the Kanhaiya Sirdar Jai Singh and Hakikat Singh, old freinds of the Ramgarhias, Sirdar Charat Singh (grandfather of the Maharaja Ranjit Singh), Nahar Singh Chamiariwala and many others. They attacked Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia on all sides while no one came to his assistance. There were only ten thousand horsemen in his service He held on for four years against the combined forces of the opponents; his brother Sirdar Tara Singh was killed in action, Sirdar Khushal Singh another brother was severly wounded. There were left only four thousand horsemen, the rest having been killed. So, he had to leave the Punjab. Crossing the Sutlej he overran the country with his horsemen and marched up to the walls of Muthra and Agra. On one occasion he penetrated into Delhi itself, and after plundering and burning the Mugal Mahalla, went into the Fort and carried off 4 pieces of cannon and many other things from the Mugal quarter. Passing through Panipat and Karnal he attacked the Nawab of Meerut, and after defeating him got a promise ten thousand rupees per annum as tribute. He also received large presents from the Rajas of Bharatpur and Dholpur. The Maharaja of Jaipur's attitude was also cordial towards him, and he received many presents from that prince. Among these was a *Gupti* (sword-stick) which is still in the possession of the family. The name of the Maharaja is engraved upon it in golden letters in Persian characters.

At this time there arose a quarrel between Raja Amar Singh of Patiala and the Nawab of Patodi and several other chiefs. The Raja called Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia to his assistance. The Sirdar at once proceeded there and defeated the enemies of the Raja. He took many villages on the banks of Jumna. The following chiefs, combined together, opposed him here : Sher Singh of Buria, Gurdit Singh La-

dowal, Baghel Singh of Salodi, Gurbakhsh Singh of Umballa. A very severe struggle was the result, in which ultimately Sirdar Jassa Singh proved victorious and received valuable peace-offerings from each of these chiefs. The following instance will show that, in spite of the hardening effects of constant warfare, the Sirdar was a Knight-errant always at heart, ready to 'poise his lance' on behalf of the victims of tyranny and oppression. One day a Brahman complained to him that the Governor of Hissar had carried off his two daughters by force. Sirdar Jassa Singh at once marched against the place, which he took and sacked. He slew the Nawab with his own hands and restored the girls to their father. Fearing lest the local Brahmans in their blind bigotry might outcaste the girls, the Sirdar collected all the Brahmans of the district and obliged them to take food from the hands of the girls. Having put Saadat Ali Khan, the son of the deceased Nawab, on the *guddee* he got Rs. 50,000 from him as *peshkash* and the same amount from the inhabitants of the city as *Nazrana*. Thus he moved about for five years in Rajputana and N. W.P., shedding lustre on the Khalsa arms by his prowess and martial achievements. He was at times reduced to great straits. At Sirsa, for example, his troops asked for the payment of the arrears of their pay, but the Sirdar had not money enough for the purpose. In his sore need he devoutly prayed for help from Above. And most providentially he obtained the means to get out of his trouble. It so happened that a servant of the Sirdar dropped his vessel into a well. A diver was sent down to recover it, and he discovered at the bottom four boxes, full of gold Mohurs, to the value of five lacs of rupees. The Sirdar thanked the Timeless Being fervently for bestowing on him such a gift at such a critical moment, which not only enabled him to pay his troops, but also to enlist more.

In 1783 Providence provided the opportunity for Sirdar Jassa Singh's return to the Punjab There arose a quarrel between the Sukerchakian and the Kanhaiya Misls. Being too weak to enter the field alone, against the forces of Kanhaiya and Bhangi Misls, Sirdar Mahan Singh, the head of the Sukerchakian (father of Maharaja Ranjit Singh) cast about for an ally. He, therefore, made overtures of friendship to Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia who was universally considered one of the boldest Sikh barons of the time. Envoys were immediately sent inviting him to return to the Punjab. Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia, in addition to being a brave soldier, was also a farsighted statesman. He at once perceived what the consequences of the proposed alliance

would be. So he sent the following message to Sirdar Mahan Singh : "When Sirdar Jai Singh is subdued he is sure to have his grand-daughter betrothed to your son Ranjit Singh, and also will give back the fort of Kangra to Raja Sansar Chand, thus you will all become good friends again, and allied opponent of mine. It is useless, therefore, to ask me to interfere in your matters." On hearing this answer Sirdar Mahan Singh and his friend Raja Sansar Chand of Katauch and other hill Rajas again sent a message to Sirdar Jassa Singh assuring him that if he would help them against Sirdar Jai Singh, they would never cease to be his friends. Sirdar Jassa Singh having satisfied himself as to the motive underlying Sirdar Mahan Singh's offer, and being convinced that it was sincere, lost no time in returning to the Punjab with all the forces he could collect. The combined forces of Sirdar Mahan Singh and Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia now appeared suddenly with a few miles of Batala, the principal town of the Kanhaiya territory. Sirdar Jai Singh was now called upon to surrender the share of the Ramgarhia possessions which had been unfairly allotted to him, and on his refusal the invaders proceeded to occupy and ravage the country. Sirdar Jai Singh mustered his Misl and placing his son Gurbakhsh Singh at the head of 8,000 horsemen sent him to expel the invaders. A desperate engagement ensued, in which Gurbakhsh Singh exposed himself with the rashness of youth, and was shot dead by Sirdar Jassa Singh's arrow. On hearing the death of his son Sirdar Jai Singh dismounted from his horse, and emptying his quiver at the enemy exposed himself to their fire. The Ramgarhias, even though flushed with victory, respected the grief of the Sirdar for the death of his brave son, and drew their forces off with a view to seizing Riarki. Jai Singh returning to Batala, erected a tomb on the northern side of the city near a nullah over the remains of his son. Being hard pressed by Sirdar Jassa Singh he was compelled to leave Batala. The city being taken possession of by the Ramgarhias, Soiyan was now the only place that remained in the hands of Sirdar Jai Singh, who began to plunder the possessions of the Kanhaiya Misl on the banks of Bias. Misfortune never comes alone; Sirdar Jai Singh was threatened from another quarter. Sansar Chand, the hill chief of Katauch, bore enmity towards Sirdar Jai Singh on account of the latter having taken his fort of Kot Kangra. He came down as far as Hajipur, seizing all the country between that place and the hills, including Mukerian. Sirdar Jai Singh was now anxious to make peace with Raja Sansar Chand and Sirdar Mahan Singh, and in order to secure it he gave up Kot Kangra to Sansar Chand who

promised (against his promise with Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia) to help him against the Ramgarhias, and restored to Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia his old possessions, while to cement his friendship with Mahan Singh he betrothed Mehtab Kaur, the daughter of his deceased son, to the youthful Ranjit Singh afterwards known as the 'Lion of the Punjab'. The betrothal took place in 1785 and the marriage at the close of the following year. Having accomplished this important object Sirdar Jai Singh, being joined by the Rajas of Nurpur and Chamba as well as Sansar Chand, and Sirdar Mahan Singh. marched against Batala. Sirdar Jassa Singh was in the city, prepared for the siege, which was raised after being carried on for 20 days. Sirdar Jassa Singh, as a measure of protection, resolved to surround Batala with a very high wall of bricks, but could only finish one side of it. Hence Sirdar Jassa Singh was not destined to enjoy peace, and for many years he was engaged with varying success, in disputes with the Kanhaiya Misl, which had the aid of Sirdar Mahan Singh and Raja Sansar Chand.

In 1796 took place his last and most severe struggle with the Kanhaiya Misl. Mai Sada Kaur, widow of Gurbakhsh Singh, was the head of the Misl and with her own forces, and those of her son-in-law Maharaja Ranjit Singh, the Lion of the Punjab, and of others as Sirdar Fateh Singh Ahluwalia son of Sirdar Jassa Singh Ahluwalia, she besieged Sirdar Jassa Singh in Miani fort on the banks of Bias in Hoshiarpur district. Sirdar Jassa Singh defended himself for some time, but his provisions ran short and he sent a message to Sahib Singh Bedi at Amritsar begging him to mediate between himself and his enemies. Sirdar Jodh Singh Wazirabadia and Dul Singh Gil were with the Bedi as representatives of Ranjit Singh, when the Ramgarhia messenger arrived. Sahib Singh sent them with a message to Sada Kaur and Ranjit Singh bidding them raise the siege of Miani. But Sada Kaur would not return without having had her revenge for her husband's death, and she knew that her enemy was now in her hands so no notice was taken of the Bedi's injunction. Again Sirdar Jassa Singh sent a messenger to the Bedi, who sent word in reply that the Sirdar's enemies would not mind him (the Bedi), but the Guru himself would help him. The messenger returned to Miani, and, wonderful to relate, that very night the river Bias came down in flood and swept away a large portion of the Kanhaiya camp, men, horses, and camels Sada Kaur and Ranjit Singh escaped with difficulty and retired to Gujranwala.

Sir Lepel Griffin writes in his ***Ranjit Singh*** (***Rulers of India*** series) : "by the bold and successful measure Ranjit Singh became

possessed of the two Sikh capitals political and religious i.e., Lahore and Amritsar, and had little more to fear in his carreer of conquest. For the great Kanhaiya confederacy was already in his hands and the famous Ramgarhia baron Sirdar Jassa Singh was old and feeble and Ranjit Singh knew that he had not long to wait before he should obtain his estates."

In 1800 a cabal was formed against Ranjit Singh who had captured Lahore in July of the preceding year, and whose successes were beginning to fill all the Punjab chiefs with alarm. Besides others there were the following Sirdars in it : Sirdar Gurdit Singh and Sahib Singh Bhangi, Sirdar Jodh Singh of Wazirabadia, Nizam Din of Kasur, Sirdar Jodh Singh Ramgarhia son of Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia, who being too old could not come in person. The great Bhangi cannon (which is now placed at Lahore opposite the Municipal market) with many other pieces of cannon was also with them. Sirdar Gulab Singh Bhangi was appointed to be their leader and commander. When they reached Bhuseen, which is situated towards the east of Lahore at a distance of 14 miles, they halted to wait for other Sirdars who were coming to join them. They determined to attack with all their combined forces and to decide the fate of Ranjit Singh once for all in a single decisive battle. Ranjit Singh heared of this at Lahore and was very much alarmed as he had not sufficient money to distribute to his forces and make them sacrifice their lives for him. A very old man aged ninety came to him and said that he could tell him about a treasury and also some pieces of cannon which Mir Muin-ul-Mulk had buried. Ranjit Singh as if got new life on hearing such happy news and flattered him. When the ground was dug he found a treasury of many lacs of rupees and also a few pieces of cannon. He at once fortified his castle and distributed large sums of money to his forces and marched from Lahore with all his forces and reached at a distance of one mile from the allied forces of his enemies. The hostilities lasted many months without any result. One day Sirdar Gulab Singh called all the Sikh Sirdars and said that they must fight a decisive battle on the morrow. All agreed to the proposal, but early next morning he did not appear in the field, and when some persons were sent to call him from his tent he was found dead in his bed, having drunk too much overnight. On his death many Sirdars made friends with Ranjit Singh, while Sirdar Jodh Singh and others went back to their respective territories. Thus did Ranjit Singh continue to be the Master of Lahore.

The nephew of Sirdar Jassa Singh proved himself a worthy scion of the Ramgarhia family at this time. His name was Sirdar Diwan Singh. One day he came to his uncle and complained about the smallness of his allowance and begged that it be increased. But Sirdar Jassa Singh gave a very cold answer and said that now he was a young man and must make his own fortune in the world. The youthful Sirdar at once left the house with a few horse and foot soldiers. Many adventurers knowing him to be the nephew of Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia became his followers. Within a few short months he conquered a territory the annual revenue of which amounted to [illegible] lac of rupees and built himself a fort near Kadian and named it [illegible]. With a garrison of [illegible] horsemen he fixed his residence in it. Sirdar Jassa Singh was very much pleased to hear of the success of his nephew.

Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia died of fever not long after in the year [illegible] A.D. The family is proud to still have his sword with his name engraved upon the hilt in golden letters and in Gurmukhi characters.

He was one of the bravest and noblest of Sikh persons in his time, and in many battles it was through his personal valour alone that the Sikhs became victorious. History tells us that it was principally through his help that the Bhangi Misl became so powerful in every respect. His own Misl was second to none except that of the Bhangis, and so it is placed second by all historians. Whoever sought his protection was given shelter. When Nawab Bhamboo Khan, brother of Ghulam Kadir, after assassinating Shah Alim the Emperor of Delhi, took refuge with him, he gave him a *jagir* in Majha and kept him as his protege. Sirdar Liaq Singh, captive in the hands of Maharaja Ranjit Singh, ran away and came to him, and he took him under his protection. He waged war for his sake with the Maharaja for 4 months, but did not give him up. Once the Emperor of Delhi sent him a khilat including among other things a *tabar* (halberd). The Sirdar took only the weapon himself and distributed all the other things among his courtiers. This relic is still kept as a heirloom in the family. He was one of the two chief personalities of the Khalsa nation; the only other name that can be placed along side of his is that of his illustrious namesake Sirdar Jassa Singh Ahluwalia. These two great chiefs were unapproachable among Sikh leaders. As brilliant on the battle field as on the council board, they were born to command and to lead. When he (Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia) was attacked by the Ahluwalia chieftain and obliged to leave the Punjab it was because almost all the other Sikh Sirdars

were, owing to a spirit of jealousy and rivalry, leagued against him, and he displayed a fertility of resource and indomitable pluck in those dark days that mark him out as far and away the superior of all his contemporaries and adversaries in the qualities of a born leader of men. Napoleon Bonaparte when he came back beaten from the field of Waterloo declared that he was more proud of that defeat than of any of his victories. It requires no extraordinary power of imagination to realize in all their grandeur the martial virtues of the man who single-handed stood for four years against an enemy whose forces numbered seven times his own. According to his lights and according to the standard of his time, he was also an orthodox Sikh, penetrated with a sense of the transitoriness of the world. He took a leading part in every fight for the faith. The *Panth* had the first place in his thoughts. It was his habit to frequently repeat a poem which he had himself composed. It is impossible to convey its beauty and force in a translation, and its subjoined literal rendering is not calculated to do justice to it. However, it is quoted below :

"There is a time when we carry[1] hawks on our hands, and *Dhaunsās*[2] (large kettle drums) thunder at our doors. There is a time again when we are on foot and carry loads upon our necks or shoulders."

"There is a time when we have no appetite for the choicest delicacies."

"There is a time when even a handful of wheat we cannot get."

"There is a time when we have crowds of beggars at our doors."

"There is a time when we sit as a supplicant at the door of others."

"Let us not then forget the name of the Lord, nor lose heart, let us be content in whatever state it pleaseth God to keep."

It would be hard to match the above lines for the simple piety they breathe, the humble trust on High they inculcate, the spirit of manly self-reliance they infuse, the lesson of the transitoriness of the world they teach, the change of fortune they portray and the sermon of contentment they preach.

II

Sirdar Jassa Singh was succeeded by his eldest son Sirdar Jodh Singh Ramgarhia who, aided by Sansar Chand, the hill chieftain, took back by force the following important towns from the Ahluwalia

1. Emblem of royalty.
2. Kettledrum and banners constitute the insignia of chiefship.

Misl : Garh, Depalpur, Bhunga, and Hoshiarpur. He gave after a time, Hoshiarpur in *Jagir* to Nawab Bhamboo Khan; to Muhar Singh, Hazura Singh and Thakar Singh, who were dismissed by Sirdar Fateh Singh Ahluwalia, he gave five villages in jagir. Sirdar Fateh Singh Ahluwalia and Sirdarni Baghel Singh collected a force of twenty thousand men and marched against Sirdar Jodh Singh, who, aided by Nidhan Singh, came forth to meet the enemy A great battle was fought at Banola, in which, however, Sirdar Fateh Singh was worsted.

The following story which Sir Lepel Griffin by mistake has attributed to Sirdar Jodh Singh Wazirabadia is really about Sirdar Jodh Singh Ramgarhia, because it is found in the family records which were put together by the late Sirdar Mangal Singh Ramgarhia C.S.I. "The Maharaja thinking Sirdar Jodh Singh too powerful to attack, invited him to Lahore on a friendly visit. Suspecting Ranjit Singh's intention he brought a large force with him which he was asked to send back, a request which he was too proud to refuse compliance. He attended the Durbar next day with only twenty-five followers whom he left outside. He was received by the Maharaja with the utmost cordiality, but suddenly Ranjit Singh made a sign to his people to seize the Sirdar. He, drawing his sword, called on them to come on as he would not be taken alive and had never learned to turn his back on an enemy. His courage so impressed the Maharaja that he dismissed the chief with honour, rich presents and an addition to his estates. So far the story is creditable to Ranjit Singh as well as to the Sirdar, but when shortly afterwards Jodh Singh died leaving only infant sons, the Maharaja seized all his possessions."

When Holkar, at the head of a large Maratha force, came to the Punjab, he being invited by Sirdar Fateh Singh Ahluwalia plundered and destroyed nearly 50 villages of Sirdar Jodh Singh who at once sent two messengers named Raj Singh and Lakha Singh to Major Lake who was pursuing Hulkar. The British commander received them with due formality and gave them robes of honour. He also sent a rifle and a field glass to the Sirdar. Both of these are still preserved as an heirloom in the family. After this Sirdar Jodh Singh entered into friendship with the Afghans of Kassur. Many times did Ranjit Singh attack his territory, but the Sirdar with the help of the Afghans always defeated him.

A compact of enternal friendship between Ranjit Singh and

and the Ramgarhia family was drawn up before the *Granth* in the Holy Darbar Sahib at Amritsar. Ranjit Singh stamped the paper in his royal and illiterate way with his open palm dyed with saffron. The better to inveigle Sirdar Jodh Singh he went over to the Ramgarh fort almost unattended. He professed his great admiration for the fortifications and ordered the foundation of a fort, afterwards called Gobindgarh (which still exists at Amritsar to the west of the city) to be laid down according to the same plan. The simple hearted Sirdar Jodh Singh was won over. He accompanied the Maharaja with all his forces in the last successful expedition against Kutb-ud-din Khan. Mr. Prinsep wtites in his life of *Maharaja Ranjit Singh* :

"Ranjit Singh who was himself free-spoken and allowed great latitude in conversation to his courtiers received at this period a rebuke for the grasping disposition he displayed in his treatment of the old Sikh Sirdars from Jodh Singh Ramgarhia, himself a reduced chief of the class. When taking his leave to join Muhkam Chand in the operations against the Faizulapurian Sirdars, Ranjit Singh offered him presents as a mark of a favour. He begged, however, with characteristic frankness that such a honour might be dispensed with in his case, for he should deem himself fortunate in these times if allowed to keep his own turban on his head. Ranjit Singh took no offence at his freedom, but smiled and told him to be faithful and of good cheer."

It was with his assistance as well as that of Sirdar Fateh Singh Ahluwalia that the Maharaja could take Kangra and subdue Raja Sansar Chand. He also helped the Maharaja in Multan expedition. The Maharaja being pleased gave him many villages in jagir which were taken from Sirdar Golab Singh Khorara, the revenue of which amounted to 25 thousand Rs. per annum. In 1811 A D. he gave him in jagir 11 villages in Sheikhupura, and also one elephant, the revenue of these villages amounted to Rs. 12,000 per annum. He was much respected by the Maharaja who used to call him Bābā-jī and give him a seat next to him, whenever he used to go in the Darbar. The Sirdar died in 1816. Like his father he was also brave and generous. Whoever sought his protection received it. He gave shelter to Sirdar Gulab Singh Bhangi and also to Bibi Lashmi of Phagwara who were defeated by Ranjit Singh. It was he who built the great Ramgarhia *Bungā*, with its two lofty towers. He helped much in the building of the Golden Temple. He brought the pieces of perforated marble

that serve as parapets on both side of the causeway that leads to the Temple situated in the centre of the tank, from the four minarets of the *maqbara* (tomb) of Jahangir situated near Shahdara on the bank of Ravi, close to Lahore, the lower storeys of these minerets are still destitute of the parapet. He also brought many pieces of mosaic work and finely tasselated and checkered pieces of marble from Muhammadan monuments situated as far as Delhi and Agra. He also built the first two storeys of Baba Atal (the loftiest building in the city of Amritsar, the towers of his own Bunga being second in height). Thus he has the honor to build the finest and the loftiest edifices of Amritsar which constitute the integral part of the beauty of the city as a whole. The family still possesses a *Khandā* and a *Katār* of this brave man as an heirloom.

The death of Sirdar Jodh Singh was the singnal for the breaking out of dissensions in the family. Sirdar Diwan Singh, Wir Singh, Mehtab Singh and widow of Sirdar Jodh Singh all set up claims for the estate. The Maharaja, hearing of this, summoned them to Nadaun where he then was, promising to settle the dispute by arbitration. On their arrival they were received with courtesy by the Maharaja, but he soon took occasion to leave the reception tent, which was straightway surrounded with troops and the three Ramgarhias were made prisoners. Then Ranjit Singh marched on towards Amritsar and after some severe fighting took the fort of Ramgarh. Again marching northward he seized the whole of the vast Ramgarhia jagirs and in a short time reduced all their forts. Thus was fulfilled the saffron bond ! There was a proverb in the country that it would take a year to conquer the Ramgarhia family, if it lost one fort per day, because the family had 360 forts. But when fate was adverse, a few hours sufficed to change the state of the family. Sirdar Wir Singh and Mehtab Singh were soon released and were placed under Sirdar Lehna Singh of Majitha, a jagir of 45,000 was settled on the family. Sirdar Diwan Singh for some time refused to accept his share of Rs. 12,000 and remained a prisoner, but at length pretended to acquiesce. On regaining his freedom, however, he fled to Patiala where he was well received by Maharaja Karam Singh and remained there for 10 months. Here many old retainers of the Ramgarhia clan came and assembled round him. When their number swelled to a thousand, the Rajas of Patiala, Nabha, and Jind suspected the Sirdar to be a secret agent sent by the Maharaja to seize their territories, so they asked him to keep only

four or five hundred men and dismiss the others. The Sirdar not agreeing to the proposal took friendly leave of them and wandered about for some time. Afterwards, at the intercession of some Sirdars, the Maharaja gave him jagir worth Rs 97,000 per annum and sent him in command of 1,000 men to Baramoola cantonment in Kashmir, a difficult hill post on the road to Sirinagar, which was on the frontier of the Maharaja's territory. Moreover, he was allowed, as a perquisite, to get shawls worth Rs. 7,000 annually from the Governor of Kashmir. In 1828 the Maharaja fell sick. The Sirdar hearing of his illness at once came to Lahore with all his forces he had under him without any permission and even the information of the Maharaja. By chance the Maharaja recovered very soon. He understood very well the purpose of the Sirdar's coming and took no offence of it, but pleased him with many rich gifts. The Sirdar went back to Baramoola where he died in 1834 after remaining there for 14 years. His *Samadh* together with a large Dharmsala is situated there on the banks of Jhelum. The house where the Sirdar used to live was situated at a distance of few miles from Sirinagar, all signs of it have disappeared but the place is marked by some lofty popular trees and is still called cantonment of Sirdar Diwan Singh Ramgarhia. Sirdar Wir Singh had died 6 years before, i.e., in 1828 when 2/3 of his jagirs were resumed.

III

After the death of Sirdar Diwan Singh, his son Sirdar Mangal Singh became the representative of the family. He during his younger days served about the person of the Maharaja, who gave him jagirs in Dharamkot, Kalowal, Tibroh and Kadian worth Rs. 9,000 of which Rs. 3,600 personal and Rs. 4,500 pay. After his father's death Sirdar Mangal Singh was sent to Peshawar in command of 400 foot and 110 sawars of the old Ramgarhia clan. Here under Sirdar Tej Singh and Sirdar Hari Singh Nalwa, he did good service and fought in famous battle of Jamrud in April 1837, where the gallant Hari Singh was killed. In 1839 he was recalled and sent to the hill country between Beas and Sutlej under the orders of Sirdar Lahna Singh and during the absence of that chief at Peshawar was placed in charge of the hill forts and was active in the suppression of the insurrection of 1840. He built many forts on the frontier according to the orders of the Maharaja. The great Ramgarhia Bunga (which with other forts and territory was taken by Ranjit Singh on the death

of Sirdar Jodh Singh) was given back to him as a special reward by the Maharaja, and so the Bunga became the property only of this branch of the family. After this he was appointed by the Maharaja to the responsible and coveted post (for which he was fitted) of collecting the tribute from the hill Rajas (the very chieftains who once used to pay tribute to his ancestors). He performed his duties to the entire satisfaction of the Maharaja for which he got many robes of honor and testimonials at different times from the Maharaja, some of these documents are still with the family. There have been three great occasion for the English Government to test the loyalty of the Punjab inhabitants, specially the Sikhs. At each of these occasion Sirdar Mangal Singh was the representative of the family and did his best for the English cause.

The Ist Sikh War

On this occasion the Sirdar was at Mandi appointed by the Sikh Government to collect the tributes from all the hill Rajas. He held in check all the hill Rajas and prevented their coming against the British. He garrisoned himself in the fort of Cumlah which commands all the hill roads. Unfortunately his two infant sons (one was the late Sirdar Gurdit Singh Ramgarhia and the other named Hardit Singh* died very young) fell into the hands of the hill Rajas who were beseiging the fort. An incident is related of this seize which shows the chivalrous sense of duty of this Sirdar. The beseigers put the little ones in front of the attacking line but the Sirdar did not hesitate to fire saying that he would not give up his cause for the sake of his children, if he lived through it God would give him more children. Providence rewarded him for his steadfastness and firmness. The babes escaped unhurt ! The Rajas, impressed by the determination of the Sirdar, and considering the fort too strong to be reduced by them, raised the seige. On the memorable 9th of March, 1846, a treaty was concluded between the English and the Sikhs, and the Sirdar received word from Sir John Lawrence informing him of the

* Many wonderful stories are told of this marvellous child. It would not be out of interest to relate one of them. While quite a child he use to ask the head Munshi of the family to supply him with slips of paper with names of different villages written on them. In his childish manner he used to sign them with his own hands and then to distribute them among the servants telling them if they presented these slips when he became of age these villages would be actually given to them.

compact. The Sirdar at once obeyed the order and vacated the fort. Sir Lepel Griffin writes in the *Punjab chiefs* :

"The Rajput chiefs with Raja Balbir Sen of Mandi at their head were not slow to take advantage of the war with the English and gave the Sirdar plenty of work, but he held his ground till the treaty of 9th March, 1846, enabled him to give up his trust with honour."

Second Anglo-Sikh War

The second occasion was the second Sikh war. At this juncture the Sirdar took upon himself the duty of guarding the communication between the Amritsar and Gurdaspur district and captured the notorious rebel Hari Singh. Sir Lepel Griffin records as follows :

"During the second Sikh war Sirdar Mangal Singh remained loyal and did excellent service in guarding the roads and maintaining order in the Amritsar and Gurdaspur districts. His great exploit, however, at this time was the capture of the notorious rebel and robber Hari Singh who had for sometime kept the country about Amritsar in a state of alarm. This he effected at Sagarpura near Rangar Nangal for which a grant of jagir worth Rs. 3,700 was made to him by the Darbar and confirmed after the annexation." For this service he also got a *khilat* and the following things from the English Government :—

Sword	Gold Bracelet,	Horse,	Shawl Cashmere,
(still with the family), one;	one;	one;	one.

The third occasion was the Mutiny. At this occasion the Sirdar raised 20 sawars according to the order of the Government. Himself being too old to go in the field in person, he sent his eldest son Sirdar Gurdit Singh Ramgarhia who joined Colonel Abbot at Hushiarpur and served to the entire satisfaction of his officers. According to the orders of Captain Harnas, Assistant Resident, Lahore, Sirdar Mangal Singh joined the forces of General Havelock to suppress the riot created by Ram Singh, &c.

In 1862 on the retirement of Sirdar Jodh Singh Man, he was appointed Manager of the affairs of the Sikh Temple at Amritsar. This appointment, which was one of some difficulty, was filled by the Sirdar with tact and ability, as will be seen from the testimonials. In the same year he was appointed an honorary Magistrate of the city at Amritsar. In 1864 the title of *Sirdār Ba-Wikār* (Sirdar with honor) was conferred upon him. In 1876, His Royal Highness the

Prince of Wales was graciously pleased to confer upon him the Companionship of the Star of India and adorned the breast of the Sirdar with the Star with his own royal hands on the platform of the Clock Tower at the time of the visit to the Temple. He was also presented to his Royal Highness in the Levee at Lahore. He died in 1879. Sir Lepel Griffin writes of him :

"Sirdar Mangal Singh was a man of education and liberal ideas. It was in a great measure owing to his influence and example that the case of Female Education has been so widely and systematically taken up in the city of Amritsar." He took great interest in the University movement. He used to take great part in all public movements. As an Honorary Magistrate he performed his duties so well that he received the thanks of the Government of India for it. He died in 1879 nearly at the age of 80 years. The family has the pride of still possessing his sword with his name written upon the hilt in golden letters in Gurmukhi character. He remained the Manager of the Golden Temple for 17 years from 1862 to his death in 1879. He was skilled in all soldierly exercises. He was a first-rate archer and swordsman and one of the most experienced Sikhs in the use of the gun, revolver and even pellet-bow and used to strike the golden pinnacles of the towers of the Ramgarhia Bunga on the 1st attempt with any of these weapons standing at a distance of nearly 156 ft. from the foot of the tower and thus covering a range of 220 ft. nearly at an inclination of 45° to horizon (because the height of the towers is nearly 156 ft. from the ground). He was very fond of horses and was a great horseman.

On one occasion when he was the Manager of the Golden Temple, His Highness the Maharaja of Patiala visited the Temple. When returning from the temple the Maharaja, remembering the friendship that had always subsisted between the Patiala and Ramgarhia families, took off a diamond ring worth 7 thousand Rupees from his finger and presented it to the Sirdar. The Sirdar considering the position of his family did not hesitate to put off his own ring (nearly of the same value) and presented the two rings to the Maharaja. The astonished Maharaja picked up his, the Sirdar kept his own, and thus parted the two chiefs of the two famous Sikh Misls, Phulkian and Ramgarhia He won the love and respect of all who came into contact with him. He not only received the highest testimonials from great officials for the good management of the Temple and won the golden opinion of the public of Amritsar, but

was also idolised by his subordinates and dependants. Even now there is no Pujari who ever remembers the name of the Sirdar except with respect. In his time the treasury of the temple was in a highly prosperous state. In his time many of the ornaments of the temple were made. It was he who had prepared the beautiful long canopy with silver supports. for the causeway which leads to the temple. The rules made by him are now considered the fundamental principles of the management of the same. The matters relating to the temple have always puzzled by their intricacy the managers and other Government officials who have had to come in contact with it. He was also the President of the Manging Committee of this temple, consisting of all the Sikh Sirdars of the Province.

After Sirdar Mangal Singh, his eldest son Sirdar Gurdit Singh became the head of the family. In February 1858 he joined Colonel Abbot at Hoshiarpur when that officer was raising a force of cavalry for service in Oudh He was made a Risaldar and served in the Oudh mounted Police to the complete satisfaction of his superior officers, until October 1859 when, on the reduction of the force, he returned to Amritsar where he was made 1st Class Inspector of Police. He retired in 1887.

In 1891 he was made a Divisional Darbari in succession to his father and in 1892 he was made an Honorary Magistrate. The same year he was appointed by the Government a member of the Municipal Committee of Amritsar. In 1893 he was assigned a place No. 15 in the list of Provincial Darbaries. He was also appointed by the Government to look after the affairs of the Golden Temple during the absence of Sirdar Arjan Singh Chahal. He performed these onerous duties for more than a year when he was visited by a very severe attack of paralysis. He recovered but became too weak and hence resigned the post. His advice, however, was alway sought and proved very useful. Being himself an educated man he, like his father, used to take great interest in all matters connected with education. He was not only a zealous member of the Khalsa College Committee but was one of the original promoters of the movement. He was the President of the educational Sub-committee of the Amritsar Municipality. He was also a member of the Khalsa Diwan He used to take great interest in the social reforms of his community. In 1898, the Government suggested that the heads of different communities should try to curtail expenses incurred on marriages and similar occasions on which natives are given to spend beyond

their means. He was appointed by the Government the President of the Ramgarhia community. He by convening many meetings of his brotherhood in his Bunga, at last succeeded in framing the rules calculated to achieve the above mentioned retrenchment and presented a copy of these rules to the Government in his own hand-writing. These rules are generally observed and constitute an everlasting memorial of the Sirdar's reforming zeal. He died childless in 1900.

Sirdar Suchet Singh, the younger brother of Sirdar Gurdit Singh, was in the Government service as a Munsif. But he died in 1879 a few months after the death of his father leaving one son Sirdar Bishan Singh who, after the death of Sirdar Gurdit Singh, has become the representative of the family.

Sirdar Sher Singh, the youngest brother of Sirdar Gurdit Singh, remained at home to look after the household affairs and died in 1888, leaving 2 sons Sirdar Sant Singh and Sundar Singh. Sirdar Sant Singh got education up to B.A. His name was accepted for the E.A.C. Examination, but he died in 1896, leaving no son. His younger brother Sundar Singh, the writer of these pages, is a student of the B.A. class in the Lahore Government College. A Jagir of Rs. 3,600 per annum, bestowed upon the family in perpetuity by the British Government, is enjoyed by Sirdar Bishen Singh and Sundar Singh Ramgarhias in equal shares, two-third of the Jagir is in the Gurdaspur district, *i.e.*, of villages Rupowali and Rangar Nangal in Tahsil Batala and one village named Tera Kalan is in Tahsil Ajnala in the Amritsar District. Besides this the family has much landed property in the city of Amritsar. Sirdar Bishen Singh is a court Inspector at Simla. He succeeded his uncle as a *Darbari*. He is a well educated and hard working man and knows well the following four languages, English, Persian, Urdu and Gurmukhi. He has two sons Sirdar Narain Singh, a student of the M.B. School at Amritsar and the other is only few months old.

The title Ramgarhia

The word Ramgarhia is composed of the terms *Ram* (God) and *Garh* (fort). Hence the adjective Ramgarhia means Custodians of the Castle of God. The fort which was the head-quarters of the family, the history of which is given hereafter, was named Ramgarh. This name is also given to a ***Bunga*** (mansion) and a *Katra* (a large portion of the city) both of which are situated on the eastern side of the city of Amritsar, the history of the each of them is given in the

sequel. As a rule all Sikhs who belong to the same caste or clan as the Ramgarhia family call themselves Ramgarhias and I am proud to note that generally they are the most orthodox desciples of the Guru. In respect of martial qualities also they are second to none in the Punjab. In their veins runs the blood of their mighty forefathers and martyrs, their frames possess the indomitable spirit of Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia, one of the greatest generals that the soil of the Punjab has ever produced. The Great Lion of the Punjab, who had more occasions than one to experience the strength of the Ramgarhia blows, acknowledged their superiority and had so much love for this name that he proudly gave the name Ramgarhia Brigade to a brigade of some of his bravest horsemen. The martial spirit of the Ramgarhias is maintained to this day even by the British Government. The writer of the *Punjab Gazeteer*, while speaking of Ramgarhias in his description of the Amritsar District, says, "Ramgarhias though they form a separate caste, they possess all the good qualities and martial spirit of the Sikh Jats."

Thus in the military atmosphere the Ramgarhias have the honour to share up to this day, with their Jat brothers, the topmost position among the Brotherhood of Lions.

The Ramgarh Fort

As everybody knows, Muhammadans, in the reign of the Mugal Emperors especially in the time of Aurangzeb, systematically injured the religious feelings of the Sikhs. Many Sikhs were tortured so horribly that one's hair stand on end to read accounts of them. But the Khalsa withstood the waves of persecution like a rock. The Golden Temple itself was destroyed many times by them. The Sikhs rebuilt it and for its defence four forts were built by the Misls, one on each side. Two forts were built by the Bhangi Misl. One was built by Sirdar Gujar Singh, on the site were now stands the newer fort of Gobindgarh, *i.e.*, to the west of the temple. The other lay to the south of the temple and was also built by the Bhangi Misl and named the Bhangi fort. It has disappeared and the place is occupied by houses and shops, but some remains of the old building are still found there and the place is called by the the same name up to this day. The third fort was built by Sirdar Jassa Singh Ahluwalia to the north of the temple and was named Ahluwalia fort, its walls remained till 1900, when it was sold by auction and dismantled. Cloth merchants have built there many

large shops. The fourth fort was erected by Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia to the east of the temple. This fort was the oldest and was originally called Ram Rouni. The Muhammadans destroyed the fort, and it was rebuilt by Sirdar Jassa Singh Ramgarhia and named Ramgarh. The fort was the greatest of all the Ramgarhia forts and was the head-quarters of the *Misl*. When Maharaja Ranjit Singh visited the fort he admired the fortifications and at once ordered the foundations of a fort to be laid down according to the same plan. This new fort was named Gobindgarh and still exists to the north of the city. After the death of Sirdar Jodh Singh Ramgarhia, Maharaja Ranjit Singh took possession of the fort and destroyed it. Some remains of it are still found inside the city of Amritsar near the Taran Taran Gate. The family has the honour of still possessing a slice of the land on which the old fort was situated. This land with pathetic appropriateness is named "The graveyard of the family of Sirdar Mangal Singh Ramgarhia C.S.I." A stone on the entrance arch bears the above inscription in English, Urdu and Gurmukhi characters. Inside the enclosure are the grave of the deceased members of the family of Sirdar Mangal Singh Ramgarhia, the epitaph in English being engraved on the head-stone of each tomb. The oldest monument is that of Sirdar Jodh Singh Ramgarhia who died in 1816. There are the sepulchres commemorating many brave soldiers of the Ramgarhia Misl who fell fighting for it. There is also the tomb, erected by Sirdar Jassa Singh, of the Sikh Martyr Baba Dip Singh. The hallowed ground, consecarated to the remains of heroes is a place of worship of the Sikhs, who are by instinct and tradition hero-worshippers all. Like all other sacred sites, it is also in the possession of Pujaris (priests) who are as a class avaricious. Not being satisfied with temple and its income they laid covetous eyes on this "God's acre" and wished to demolish the graves of the family ! They went so far as to destroy one of the tombs, did not hesitate to claim the ground as their own openly in court. Thanks to British law and justice, however, the case was decided in favour of the family, the real owners of the land. The remaining piece of land on which the Ramgarh fort stood, is still called Ramgarh, and contains several tanks and a temple, sacred to the Sikhs. The rest of the land is given up to cultivation. Only a piece of wall remains to show that once the great Ramgarhia castle reared itself proudly there, and the grand Ramgarhia banner hoisted over it, waved its emblazoned Lions, High up in the air.

The Ramgarhia Bunga

The history of the Bunga (Punjabi word for quarters) is inseparable from the history of the Golden Temple because its very existence is dependent on the latter. During the reign of the Mughal Emperors the temple was blown up with gunpowder or destroyed by other means no less than seven times. But each time it was rebuilt by the Sikhs When it was demolished the last time, and the Sirdars of the 12 Misls assembled at the Akal Bunga (situated in the front of the temple) to consult about the reconstruction of the fane it was rightly thought that it would be no use to rebuild the temple unless some of the Khalsa leaders remained in it for its protection against their enemies. The Bhangis, the Ahluwalias and the Ramgarhias, were selected to dwell in the sacred precincts with their forces as the guardians of the temple. They were directed to call the other Sirdars for help in case of any great danger, each of the six great Misls gave also one man to serve the temple The present Pujaris are the descendants of those six men. The income of the temple after deducting other expenses is divided and sub-divided, and distributed in due proportion among the descendants of the six Pujaries. The Pujaries had some fixed duty to perform and were called according to their duties, e.g., the man who lighted the lamp was called *charāgī* (*charāg*, lamp in Punjabi) and so on. Their descendants still retain the old designations. The duty of the person given by the Ramgarhia Misl was to perform the *ardās* (offering ceremony), his descendants also are called *ardāsīās*. The ceremony is thus performed, the *ardāsīā* stands respectfully with his face to the *Granth* and distinctly repeats the name of the 10 Gurus in the prescribed manner and then says that such a person has brought such and such a thing as an offer to the Guru, may the Guru purify his soul and grant his prayer.

The Bhangis built two forts, one called fort Bhangian to the south and the other called fort Gujar Singh to the west of the temple. They also built a Bunga to the west of the temple. The Ahluwalias built one fort called the Ahluwalia fort for their army and one Bunga called the Ahluwalia Bunga for their own residence both to the north of the temple.

The Ramgarhias, likewise, rebuilt the old fort Ram Rouni for their forces and named it Ramgarh. They also built a Bunga called Ramgarhia Bunga for their own residence to the east of the temple.

Thus the temple was protected on all four sides by these Sikh Sirdars. The very structure of this bunga shows the special purpose for which it was built. The two lofty towers were obviously built to espy the enemy from a distance. The Bunga is the largest of all the mansions. The towers are each 3 storeyed and nearly 156 ft. high from the ground. No wood is used anywhere in the struction. Besides numerous masonary arches, there are 44 marble and red stone pillars (very beautifully ornamented with engraved designs) supporting the roof of the upper storey of the Bunga. The front parts is highly decorated with delicately chiselled patterns of unrivalled excellence. Here the ancient Coronation stone of the Grand Mugals (which Sirdar Jassa Singh brought from Delhi) is fixed, having 3 pillars on each side, the priest every day recites the holy Granth on this historic slab. The dimensions of the stone are 6'-3" × 4'-6" × 9". The length of the frontage of the Bunga is nearly 150 ft. One can have a very good view of the city from the upper storeys of the towers, many European visitors come to enjoy the signt and many take photographs of the extensive view below there feet. These towers are visible from many miles, and add to the beauty of the city. When Maharaja Ranjit Singh took possession of the territory of the Misl, the Bunga also went to him. The Bunga for some reason or others was only half finished and the towers were not yet domed, because it was the intention of the Sirdars to raise them higher. But Ranjit Singh at once ordered that the towers be raised no higher and all the materials and many pillars and pieces of stone and marble very beautifully engraved he sent to Ram Bag (now called Company Gardens) which he was preparing as a pleasure ground. There was such a large stock of building material that after using all that was required for the garden the remainder were stocked and employed afterwards in the preparation of the last bed for the Lion of the Punjab in the Guru Garden where free from the anxieties of the world he sleeps calmly and quietly under the serene shadow of the lofty Ramgarhia towers. By comparison also many of these pieces are found of the same pattern and sculptured by the same hand. Afterwards the Bunga was given to Sirdar Mangal Singh Ramgarhia for his personal services by the Maharaja and from that time the Bunga became the property of Sirdar Mangal Singh alone. Since that time the Bunga is used as a place of residence by the male members of the family. There is built a large house, 3

storeyed and 140 ft. long for the female members of the family in the Katra Ramgarhian. The street in which this house is built is called Koocha Sirdar Mangal Singh Ramgarhia and board is put up there by the Municipality with the above inscription. The fact that the family has fixed its abode in the proximity of the Bunga with temple is one of the chief causes that enabled the members of this family to manage the affairs of the Golden Temple so well. This family has been connected with the temple from the very beginning, and thus its members know the whole process of its evolution, and the principles required to manage its affairs. The members of this family, besides, consider it a religious duty to look after the shrine. Aye, for this temple their ancestors gladly risked and laid down their lives. It is for these reasons that Sirdar Mangal Singh was appointed the President of the managing committee of the temple consisting of all the Sikh Sirdars of the Punjab.

There is a celebrated temple called Hazur Sahib situated in Dakhan in the State of His Highness the Nizam of Hydrabad. Round that temple also there are Bungas built by the Sikh Sirdars. The Ramgarhias also built a Bunga there which exist to this day and is grander than all other Bungas and is also called Bunga Ramgarhian.

Katra Ramgarhian

The Ramgarhian Katra (Bazar) was the natural adjunct of the Ramgarhia fort, which, as has been stated, was the chief seat of the family, and the head-quarters of the Ramgarhia army, numbering thousands. The Bazar arose on the space between the Ramgarh fort and the Bunga in the environs of the temple, and named Ramgarhian Katra. In the same way the Ahluwalias built a Bazar between their fort and the temple and named it Katra Ahluwalian. The Ramgarhian Katra is the greatest of all the katras and covers an area extending over 3 gates of the city. This is one more proof of the fact that the Ramgarhia forces appointed to guard the temple were more numerous than those of any other Misl. This Katra constitutes one-fourth of the city. It is still known by that old name and the sign-boards with the inscription (Katra Ramgarhian) are put up by the Municipality on its boundaries. In this way the memory of this great house is kept to this day.

GENEALOGICAL TREE

- S. HARDAS SINGH, D. 1716
  - S. Bhagwan Singh, D. 1787
    - S. Jai Singh, D. 1756
      - S. Jodh Singh, D. 1816
      - S. Wir Singh, D. 1828
    - S. Jassa Singh, D. 1800
    - S. Khushal Singh, D. 1812
    - S. Mali Singh, D. 1802
    - S. Tara Singh, D. 1797
      - S. Diwan Singh, D. 1834
        - S. Mangal Singh, B. 1800, D. 1879
          - S. Gurdit Singh, B. 1837, D. 1900
          - S. Suchet Singh, B. 1842, D. 1879
            - S. Bishan Singh, B. 1868
              - S. Narain Singh, B. 1884
              - S. Surain Singh, B. 1901
          - S. Sher Singh, B. 1846, D. 1888
            - S. Sant Singh, B. 1870, D. 1894
            - S. Sundar Singh, B. 1879
        - (further line off page)
      - (further line off page)

List of Khilats given to Sirdar Mangal Singh Ramgarhia, by the British Government of different occasions.

Sword (still with the family), one ;	Gold Bracelet, one pair;	Horse, one;	Cashmere Shawl, one.

(2) 1849 A.D. by the Governor General at Lahore.
Pearl necklace, one ; Cashmere Shawl, one.

(3) 1850 A.D., 7th September, by the Governor General at Lahore.
Gold Bracelet, Jewelled, one pair ; Cashmere Shawls, seven.

(4) 1859 A.D., 23rd February, at Lahore.
Gold Bracelet Jewelled, one pair ; Cashmere Shawls, nine.

(5) 1860 A.D., 14th February, by the Lieut.-Governor of the Punjab.
Gold Bracelet Jewelled, one pair ; Cashmere Shawls, seven.

(6) 1864. Title of Sirdar Ba-wikar (Sirdar with honour) ; Cash, Rs. 375

(7) 1869, 16th March, at Amritsar, by the Deputy Commissioner.
One horse.

(8) 1872, 22nd March, by the Lieutenant-Governor of the Panjab, at Amritsar.
Pearl necklace, one ; Cashmere Shawl, one.

(9) 1872, 21st October, by the Governor General, at Lahore.

Pearl necklace, one ;	Silver perfume-sprinkler (Cashmere made, a work of art), one;	Revolver, Breach loader, Gold mounted, one;	Cashmere Shawls, one.

The Punjab Disturbances of 1907 : the Response of the British Government in India to Agrarian Unrest

N. GERALD BARRIER*

Two major factors determined the growth of Indian nationalism : developments within Indian society and indigenous political organizations and the British response to agitation and the demands of Indian politicians and interest groups. Current studies of Indian nationalism generally focus upon the former, while the relation of British rule to political development is either ignored or misunderstood. Frequently the British are portrayed as inept bureaucrats, or the government as a monolithic structure run on inflexible bureaucratic principles and bent upon a policy of repression.[1] While the shoe often fits, this caricature ignores the basic fact that, despite mounting pressure from 1904 onwards, the British rulers managed to keep order and to choose their hour of departure. They were able to continue governing primarily because they were adroit in handling agitation, minimizing serious grievances, and retreating from policies or measures which threatened to inflame the subcontinent. Professor Anthony Low of the University of Sussex has shown graphically how the Government of India manipulated Gandhi's first and second civil disobedience campaigns to its own political advantage.[2] This paper explores the background and the British response to an earlier but equally volatile situation, the 1907 rural disturbances in the Punjab.

---

* Dr N. Gerald Barrier, Department of History, University of Missourie, Columbia MO. U.S.A., 65201.

Research and preparation of the study was made possible by a United States Government Title VI Travelling Fellowship and a Duke University grant. The author is also indebted to Professor William B. Hamilton of Duke University for criticism of an earlier draft.

1. E.g., R C. Majumdar, *History of the Freedom Movement in India*, Calcutta, 1963, II, pp. 1-6, 251-64; III, pp. 67-225. For the general historiographical problem, Robert I. Crane, 'Problems of Writing Indian History', in *Problems of Historical Writing in India*, New Delhi, 1963, pp. 41-5.
2. 'The Government of India and the First Non-Cooperation Movement—1920-22', in *Journal of Asian Studies*, 25, 1966, pp. 241-59; 'Sapru and the First Round Table Conference', unpublished paper presented at the Working Conference on Indian Politics and Political History, University of Sussex, 1965.

The Punjab Government had passed several paternal measures which were calculated to improve the economic position and the standard of living among Punjabi agriculturists. In 1907 its further attempts to help the agriculturists unexpectedly resulted in the alienation of the political support of the agrarian population in the central Punjab. This area was the recruiting ground for more than a third of the Indian army. There were indications in May 1907 that the Punjabi agriculturists, as individuals and as soldiers, had moved towards rebellion. The Government of India met this challenge by putting an end to the local government's paternal programme. By extending too far the principle of helping the rural classes, the Punjab Government aroused agitation which in turn led to a retreat from rural planning and intervention into the lives of the people. The decision-making process engendered by the unrest demonstrates that the Governor-General and his Executive Council could take into account 'public opinion' when that opinion directly affected the security of the British raj. It also shows that the government was not an impersonal monolith, but an arena in which personalities, conflicting principles, and faulty channels of communication determined official policy and action.

The Issues : The Punjab Colonization of Land Bill and the Bari Doab Canal Rates

Since the annexation of the Punjab in 1849, the provincial government had prided itself on its paternal protection of the cultivating land-owner who comprised the bulk of the population. The first British rulers and their successors believed that if a paternal district officer ruled his 'flock' with an iron hand and protected them from outside threats—whether moneylender or political agitator - the zamindars (landowing cultivators) would loyally support the British government.[3] For three decades the local government relied upon a low revenue demand and land acts favouring the zamindars to ensure the economic prosperity and hence the loyalty of the rural classes, but gradually debt and loss of land to moneylenders under-

3. This attitude or administrative tradition is discussed in the following : R.N. Cust, *Memoirs of Past years of a Septuagenarian*, London, 1899, pp. 29-30; J. Douie minute, 24 December, 1900, Punjab Government (hereinafter PG) Judicial file, February 1901, 14-38A. Although a few of the PG files cited in this study are available only in the West Pakistan Record Office (hereinafter WPRO), most files are found both in the WPRO and the India Office, London.

mined their economic and social position. Fearing agrarian disaffection over the mounting debt, the government committed itself to a programme of paternal legislation to protect the zamindars and to shore up the traditional prop of British rule in the Punjab.

The first paternal legislation in 1900 was the greatest single piece of social engineering ever attempted in India, the Punjab Alienation of Land Act. The act took away the zamindar's right to sell or mortgage his land except with the prior approval of the district officer. These officers generally gave permission only when the recipient of the land could prove that he belonged to a tribe designated in the government gazette as 'agricultural.' According to the Imperial Revenue and Agricultural Department, the restrictions on land transfer would immediately halt the flow of land outside the agricultural community. The act would also prevent further indebtedness by curtailing cultivators' credit The Hindu commercial castes which monopolized moneylending in the Punjab fought the bill with memorials and public meetings, but they failed to mobilize the cultivators against legislation designed to protect the cultivator's own interests. The alienation bill became law in November of 1900.[4] Encouraged by the limitation of agitation to the urban trading class, the Punjab Government enacted additional bills designed to improve the economic condition of the zamindars and the small aristocratic class. The Punjab Pre-Emption Act provided that agnates and agriculturists residing in a village had first claim on land sold by a villager, the Court of Wards Act gave the local government the right to place insolvent aristocratic families under an official court of wards without the prior consent of the family and the Agricultural Debt Limitation Act extended the period during which debt suits could be instituted from three to six years. These bills stressing paternal protection of the rural classes were enacted within four years after the Alienation Act without arousing agitation or even adverse comment from the Punjab native press.[5] The only opposition, ironically, came from the normally pro-government *Pioneer* of Allahabad, which warned in an editorial entitled 'Bureaucracy and Ballast' that the local government had thrown away its intellectual and economic

---

4. The bill and subsequent agitation are discussed in N.G Barrier, *The Punjab Alienation of Land Bill of 1900*, Durham, N.C., 1966, Chapters 1-3.
5. J. Wilson minute, 22 February, 1904, Financial Commissioner File (WP Board of Revenue, Lahore; hereinafter cited as FCF) 441/108A.

ballast in misguided zeal end devotion to paternalism Class legislation, the *Pioneer* predicted, would ultimately destroy the peace of the Punjab.[6]

Only one piece of paternal legislation was yet to be enacted, an amendment to the 1893 Punjab Colonization of Land Act which would extend the role of the government in the daily life of the Chenab canal colony. The Punjab Government began the impressive colony in 1887. The diversion of the Chenab river into a system of perennial canals rapidly turned the barren wasteland of the central Punjab into fertile farmland. The British had committed themselves to this large capital expenditure of over Rs 30,000,000 for at least three reasons. First the authors of the project hoped that the additional land revenue from the once desolate desert would swell the provincial budget. At the same time colonization of the canal area would relieve the acute population pressure in the central districts bordering the colony. Finally, the Chenab colony was to be a social and economic experiment, a model farm for the rest of the Punjab. Healthy agricultural communities 'of the best Punjab type' would be established and kept under constant supervision. These in turn would demonstrate to other Punjabis how proper sanitation, careful economic planning, and cooperation with the government could result in a higher standard of living.[7]

The Chenab colony quickly fulfilled the first two official aspirations. By 1907 the colony had proven a financial success. The capital outlay had been repaid, while the government received over Rs. 700,000 annually as net profit from water charges and land revenue.[8] Besides this profit, the government had distributed over 2,000,000 acres of cultivable land to Muslim, Sikh, and Hindu zamindars from the crowded districts of Amritsar, Gurdaspur, Jullundur, Sialkot and Hoshiarpur. District officers chose the new settlers on the basis of their ability as agriculturists and less tangible qualifications such as family

6. *Pioneer Mail*, 27 January, 1905. Also noting in Judicial and Public File (hereinafter J & P) 1350, 1905.

7. Popham Young minute, 15 November, 1895, Government of India (hereinafter GI) Revenue File, December 1896, 22-47A ; Popham Young minute, 16 April, 1907, FCF 441/108 A. All GI files are from the National Archives of India, New Delhi.

8. *Revenue Report of the Punjab Irrigation Department, 1902-1905*, Lahore, 1905, p. 5. For the background on the colonies and irrigation, P. W. Paustian, *Canal Irrigation in the Punjab*, New York, 1930.

and 'proven loyalty' to the British.[9] The Colonization Officer was in sole charge of the colony. He divided the settlers on the basis of district, caste, and religion into small administrative areas (*chaks*). Within each village in the *chak*, the officer had made previous arrangements for sanitation and orderly bazaars. Similary, each *chak* had been carefully demarcated into agricultural zones, townships, and village greens. Each villager received at least a square of land (approximately 27 acres) and a designated plot for a house and stable. He was required to build a house, to dispose of manure, and to build a wall around his animal yard. In addition to the 'peasant grant' of one square, provisions were made for three other types of colonists. Retired soldiers from the Punjab or the neighbouring United Provinces received 'military grants' of one to three squares. Grants of similar size were allotted to 'yeomen', agriculturists with enough capital to maintain more than one square. The British felt that these yeomen were necessary to the success of the colony because they would supposedly supply the initiative and leadership required to build up community spirit. 'Capitalist grants' were large plots ranging from 5 to 100 squares which were distributed by auction to urban investors. Because the Punjab Government wanted to preserve the province as a 'country of peasant farmers', however, it distributed the bulk of the Chenab land to peasant grantees.[10] In the Rakh and Mian Ali branches, for example, 341,998 acres were held by peasants as compared to 30,473 acres by capitalists, 36,630 acres by yeomen, and 6,313 acres by military grantees.[11]

Beginning with the Chenab colonization project, the Punjab Government altered its policy of waste of land distribution. Colonists in earlier projects had been permitted to purchase proprietary rights for a nominal sum. The subsequent loss of land and the government's fear that this loss would increase in the future resulted in the decision to end the sale of land to colonists. In the Chenab and subsequent colonies, settlers were generally granted only occupancy rights, not full title to their property.[12] With the exception of the capitalists and

9. J. Beazley and F. Puckle, *The Punjab Colony Manual*, Lahore, 1922, I, pp. 5-22.
10. PG to GI, 3375, 22 July, 1891, GI Revenue, November 1891, 35-37 A ; *Chenab Colony Gazetteer*, Lahore, 1905, pp. 29-33.
11. Statistics from 'Report on the Rakh and Mian Ali Branches of the Chenab Colony', GI Revenue, September 1897, 59—62 A.
12. PG to GI, 129, 12 March, 1889, and Buck minute (26 April, 1889), GI Revenue, May 1891, 15-18A

yeomen who continued to purchase proprietary rights, all colonists were crown tenants holding their grants as long as they paid revenue and fulfilled the conditions laid down at the initiation of the grant. Conditions varied with each type of grant. Peasant grantees, for example, had to live on their land, cut wood from specified areas, maintain a clean compound, and make arrangements for sanitary disposal of night soil.[13] The Colonization Officer and his subordinate Indian staff supervised all the details of colony life in order to ensure that each colonist fulfilled his conditions and contributed to the well-being of the entire community. The officer was virtually a dictator. His word was final in all disputes over revenue or conditions, because civil courts were considered barred from intervening in government-tenant relations.[14] The officer also interfered in the social affairs of the colonists. In a period of communal tension, for example, Popham Young, the beloved Canal Officer of the Chenab, called together all the religious leaders and used his influence to prevent a riot.[15]

For several years the colony remained an idyllic example of 'good administration', a project to which Punjab officers proudly pointed as an indication of the beneficial and humanitarian effects of British rule. The first colonists did not resent the paternal attitude of the Colonization Officer — in their eyes he was an economic saviour, their *ma-bap* (parent) who loved them and gave protection against all evil.[16] Nevertheless, trouble subsequently began to appear in the colony which threatened the tranquil and prosperous atmosphere of this Punjab show-place. First, the Irrigation Department ran out of good land and distributed plots not readily accessible to canal branches. From 1902 onwards officials were faced with irate colonists in possession of inferior land.[17] Moreover, landholdings tended to become fragmented. When the original colonists died, the occupancy right of their land was sub-divided among sons. The British became alarmed at a process which if unchecked might eventually leave the colonists with only a few acres. 'A purely peasant colony with holdings getting smaller in each generation would not...be a good thing. The people might be

13. Conditions and contracts in Puckle, *Colony Manual*, vol. II.
14. FC to PG, 19 January, 1903, and noting, FCF 441/108A.
15. C. L. Tupper minute, 1 March, 1901, FCF 441/108A and Keep-With (KW).
16. Popham Young minute, 15 November, 1895, GI Revenue, December 1896, 22-47A. Young was immortalized in a sixty-stanza poem frequently read in the colony.
17. FC to PG, 19 January, 1903, FCF 441/108 A and KW.

prosperous up to a certain point, but their lives would be narrow and sordid, and Government would look in vain to them for any active help in time of trouble.'[18] Finally, the Canal Officer was finding it increasingly difficult to enforce discpline. Many colonists evaded the residence requirements, illegally cut trees, built houses in the farming plots, and led (by British standards) unsanitary lives. This tendency was particularly evident in the recently settled Gugera branch, where yeomen grantees were for the first time required to reside on their property.[19] After unsuccessfully attempting to frighten the colonists by confiscating the grants of perennial offenders, the colonization staff developed an informal system of fines which they charged in lieu of confiscation. The fine system went uncontested until 1903, but when a recording of occupancy rights generated a sharp rise in penalties, several yeomen who were lawyers or relatives of lawyers took the matter to the civil courts. To the astonishment of the Punjab Government, several legal decisions went against the Canal Officer. The 1893 act made conditions binding on the tenant and the government, but it apparently did not rule out an appeal to the courts. As the Financial Commissioner summarized :

> Heretofore the colony has resembled a new country. The prestige and authority of the Colonization Officer has been very great and the colonists have generally acquiesced in the somewhat patriarchal methods of administration which have been extremely well suited to the requirements of the case. But in no long time, as the country becomes more settled, the colonists will begin, indeed, some of them already have begun, to use the weapon of the law to resist the orders of the Colonization Officer.[20]

The Punjab Government's initial response to the erosion of paternal rule in the colony was to ensure that future colonists would be governed by more stringent conditions. The fine system, compulsory tree planting, and a higher occupancy fee were included in the contracts signed after 1902. If a new settler died without gaining occupancy rights (generally before five years), the land lapsed to the government, which reserved the right to re-allot the property to lineal heirs or to unrelated tenants. Yeomen were prohibited from trans-

18. Douie letter, *Reports for the Chenab, Jhelum, Chunian Sohaq Para Canals, 1903*, Lahore, 1904, pp. 8-9. Also, Douie minute, FCF 441/108 A.
19. B. H. Dobson, *Report on the Chenab Colony Settlement*, Lahore, 1915, pp. 9, 13-14 ; C.L. Tupper minute, 18 March, 1907, KW to FCF 441/108 A.
20. C. L. Tupper minute, 1 March, 1901, FCF 441/108 A.

ferring property rights without previous sanction of the government, a troublesome restriction apparently calculated to keep out 'undesirable' (money-lenders or urban dwellers unpopular with the British).[21] Most of the fertile land had already been distributed, however, and the Punjab Government decided to prepare a bill legalizing the fine system and remedying the numerous administrative problems which had appeared since 1893. Normally agrarian legislation was prepared in lengthy consultation with district officers and revenue experts, but this procedure was not followed in the case of the colonization bill. The colonies had always had an anomalous place in the Punjab administrative structure. The Irrigation Department controlled the building of the canals and supervised allocation of water, while the Revenue Department collected taxes. Because neither department had full jurisdiction over the colonies, they frequently fought over their administration.[22] The Financial Commissioner's office therefore drew up the bill without consulting either department in order to avoid renewing the quarrels. It only consulted the Colonization Officer, who naturallv insisted upon a defense of his personal powers. In addition to avoiding a bureaucratic struggle over jurisdiction, the Financial Commissioner hoped that the truncated legislative process would permit the government to enact a measure before its relations with the colonists disintegrated. 'Benevolent despotism' had to be prolonged, and therefore the normal consultative process was abandoned.[23]

Many of the bill's provisions were retroactive, openly abrogating the conditions originally convenanted with the colonists. Fresh conditions were added, including the planting of trees and sanitary rules. The bill forbade transfer of property by will. Only strict primogeniture as interpreted by the Canal Officer would be permitted in the future. Fines were legalized, while the courts were explicitly barred from interfering with executive orders. Although the Government of India requested clarification of several sections, it approved the bill and sent it to the Secretary of State. Two Punjnb officers, a council member, Denzil Ibbetson, and the Revenue Secretary, James Wilson, defended the bill and speeded its passage through the Indian Government

21. Dobson, *Chenab* p. 13.
22. J. F. Connolly minute, 5 September, 1903, FCF 441/108 A; FC to PG, 858, 17 October, 1901, GI Revenue, May 1902, 32-34A.
23. C. L. Tupper minute, 1 March, 1901, and noting, GI Revenue, December 1904, 8-9 A.

Secretariat.[24] In London a former Punjab Lieutenant Governor, Dennis Fitzpatrick, warned his colleagues that the bill would create a disturbance because it gave individuals too much discretionary power and interfered with 'vested interests'. The India Council and the Secretary of State agreed and ordered the Punjab by telegraph to suspend discussion of the bill.[25] Denzil Ibbetson, who had temporarily replaced Charles Rivaz as Lieutenant Governor, redrafted the objectionable portions of the bill but defended the principles of setting new conditions and interfering in succession. By the time the Government of India reviewed the modified proposals, Ibbetson had returned to the Council and supported his own bill. Curzon and his Council strongly backed the Punjab, and the India Council in London grudgingly accepted the slightly modified version.[26]

The Punjab Government introduced the bill in the local Legislative Council on 25 October, 1906. Section 8 stated that tenants held their land under old conditions and the supplementary conditions to be published in the gazette.[27] Section 18 said that in future grants, a District Commissioner would resume land upon death of a grantee if the latter had no legal heirs. In the future, land could only be transferred to a son, and if no sons survived, a widow. Sections 19-27 established retroactive conditions concerning sanitation, tree planting, and construction. In case of breach of the conditions, fines would be collected "in the same fashion as revenue.' Section 31 ruled that the courts would have no jurisdiction in the colony. The Council appointed a select committee to discuss the bill and to make necessary amendments.

The year 1906 was the wrong time to present a measure extending official powers. Discontent over maladministration in the colony, which had been spreading since 1900, had gradually come to a head. The colonists hated the extra-legal fine system that had cost them over

---

24. Wilson minute, 13 September, 1904, and council noting, GI Revenue, December 1904, 8-9 A.
25. Fitzpatrick minute, 1 January, 1905 ; Sec. of State Leg. Despatch 5, 3 March, 1905, J & P 3075, 1905.
26. PG to GI, 18, 22 January, 1906 ; Ibbetson minute, 10 February, 1906 ; GI Revenue Despatch 9, 24 May 1906, GI Revenue, May, 1906, 43-44 A ; Sec. of State Leg. Despatch 150, Revenue and Statistics File (hereinafter R & S), 1439, 1906.
27. This paragraph drawn from *Return of the Punjab Land Colonization Bill*, London, 1907, pp. 3-14.

Rs. 300,000 in penalties. More offensive than fines, however, was the rampant corruption among lower officials. The cumbersome system of assessment and records in the colony necessitated the maintenance of a large staff of Punjabi officers, whose 'pay, position, training and traditions', in the words of an experienced British official, were such that 'they are practically certain to make the greatest possible use of any opportunities they may have for extorting bribes.'[28] The fine system offered such an opportunitiy. Indian officials forced innumerable colonists to pay bribes for petty offences. The situation degenerated to the point that if a zamindar wished to visit his home village for a week, he frequently paid off the canal official so that his residency requirements would not be jeopardized. Insistence upon cleanliness and sanitation opened up additional paths for corruption. The graft became so oppressive that in 1903 a newspaper, the *Zamindar*, was started to publicize the colonists' plight.[29] The economic pressure had almost reached a breaking point by 1906. Following a fresh investigation of occupancy rights, many colonists had lost their land because they could not prove their residency status. Crop failure was the final blow. The boll worm destroyed the 1905 and the 1906 cotton crop, the chief crop in the irrigated areas.[30]

The provincial government did not take these factors into consideration primarily because of the administrative assumption that it knew what was best for the rural Punjabi. The men responsible for the measure and much of the earlier legislation—Denzil Ibbetson, James Wilson, and Charles Rivaz—conceived of the British as patriachal defenders of the cultivating class. As Financial Commissioner, Wilson prepared the first version of the bill, Lieutenant Governor Rivaz supported it, and Ibbetson defended its principles in the Executive Council.[31] Wary of interdepartmental quarrelling and confident

28. Popham Young note, in Minto to Morley, 3 July, 1907, *Minto Collection*, National Library of Scotland, Edinburgh. All Minto correspondnnce hereinafter is from the Minto Collection.

29. *Zamindar*, 11 August, 1905, *Selections from the Punjab Vernacular Press* (Hereinafter *SPVP*), 1905, p. 215. Siraj-ud-Din Ahmad, a retired postal officer who ran the paper, had no previous connexion with agitation or public criticism of the British.

30. Dobson, *Chenab*, pp. 13-14; confidential circular, 7 May, 1907, and noting, PG Revenue file (Printed), 108A.

31. The attitudes of these men are reflected in the following: Ibbetson letter to PG, March 1889, GI Judicial, December 1891, 234-300A; Rivaz minute, 24 May, 1890, GI Revenue, July 1899, 44-45A; minute, 1 September, 1904, attached to PG Revenue (Printed), 108A; Wilson minute, 4 May, 1907, GI Leg., June 1907, 4-8A.

that the bill was the only means of preserving governmental authority, the Secretariat did not circulate the measure. The Lieutenant Governor and the Financial Commissioner realized that fines and corruption occasionally upset the colonists, but they attributed the memorials and newspaper attacks to 'unreasonableness' and incurable defects in the administrative system.[32] Even if there were limited unrest, they noted, the colonists would soon realize that the British passed the seemingly harsh legislation only to protect the agriculturists. Punjabis had meekly accepted earlier legislation, and they would similarly accept the new colonization bill.[33]

By coincidence the Punjab Government also announced in November 1906 a drastic increase in the occupier rate (the charge on canal water) on the Bari Doab canal running through the districts of Amritsar, Gurdaspur and Lahore. Water rates had previously been kept lower in these districts than in the western Punjab because the Punjab Government hoped a policy of leniency would ensure the loyalty of the Sikh Jats who supplied many recruits for the Indian army. The districts watered by the Bari Doab canal were the heartland of the *manjha*, the chief recruiting ground for Sikh soldiers.[34] The 1903 Irrigation Commission had questioned the wisdom of the sacrifice of revenue and convinced the efficiency-minded Curzon that the Punjab must raise its rates. The Punjab Government accordingly deputed an irrigation official to investigate. He suggested a sharp increase, which, after slight modification, was announced in the winter of 1906. Although the enhancement averaged 25 per cent., increases on cash crops such as sugar cane and on vegetable gardens bordering urban areas ran as high as 50 per cent.[35]

As in the case of the canal colonies, the local government was not fully acquainted with the peculiar circumstances in the areas affected by its measure. The canal had been over-extended, with the result

32. 'Report on the Punjab Press, 1903', GI Public, September 1904, 218B. A voluminous file; FCF 441/108A, in filled with clippings and comments on editorials and attacks on the government.
33. Rivaz minute, 18 November, 1906, KW, FCF 441/108A.
34. PG to GI to 5377, 3 October, 1890, GI Irrigation. March 1891, 25-30A. Also discussion in the GI to PG, 511, 23 March, 1891, same file; A. H. Bingley, *Sikhs*, Simla, 1899, pp. 29, 106.
35. Sec. noting, PG Revenue, December 1902, 7-9A; Wilson minute, 8 August, 1905, GI Revenue, June 1905, 11B; Sec. noting in GI Irrigation, August 1906, 6-8A.

that the zamindars were increasingly bitter about the irregular supply of water. The Chief Engineer had inaugurated in 1905 a redistribution programme to correct the problem, but the resulting confusion over which branches would be altered and bribery demands by subordinate officials only intensified the discontent.[36] In addition, sharp rises in labour costs due to widespread deaths from plague and a series of poor harvests threatened the prosperity of the zamindars dependent upon canal irrigation.[37] The Chief Secretary, Edward Maclagan, tried to warn the Lieutenant Governor that the enhancements were inopportune. He noted that the irrigation experts had not taken into consideration human factors in recommending the increase in water rates, and that districts officers in the Delhi division had questioned the wisdom of enhancements in their territory a year earlier. If district officers in the regions affected by the increases were given a similar opportunity to express their views, Maclagan argued, perhaps the government would find that the enhancements should be postponed until further study could be completed. Rivaz rejected his opinion. The Irrigation Department was in charge of the canal, the Lieutenant Governor concluded, and had taken a fair survey of local conditions. When the Irrigation Department defended the enhancements and maintained that they would be accepted without protest, Rivaz published the notification of the increases in water rates. He categorically refused to reopen the issue and denied that district officers had insight into the working of the irrigation project.[38]

In 1906 a local government which prided itself on good relations with the cultivating class was therefore embarking upon controversial legislation and an increase in taxation without adequate study of the problems involved and without consideration of rural reaction. The Punjab authorities self-confidently assumed that they knew what was best for the cutivator. Nothing could shake the latter's trust in British goodwill. Nevertheless, within four months a virulent and unexpected response to the two mearsures indicated that the miscalculations of the government had alienated the political support of the very class upon

36. Notes by Lahore DC (22 July, 1907), FC (10 October, 1907), GI Revenue, June 1908, 15B.

37. Bari Doab Committee Report, in PG to GI, 20 RI, January 1908, GI Revenue, June 1908, 15B.

38. Maclagan minutes, 22 April, 2 May, 1906; Rivaz minute,3 May, 1906, printed notes, PG Irrigation, December 1902, 7-9A. Also Walker minute, 10 October, 1907, GI Revenue, June 1908, 15B.

which it predicated continued rule. The Punjab countryside was about to burst into flames.

Rural Agitation and the Punjab Disturbances of 1907

The Chenab colonists saw the new bill as an unjust intrusion of government into their daily lives. The bill also legalized the hated fine system and thereby widened the area within which officers could extract bribes. The editor of the *Zamindar*, Siraj-ud-Din Ahmad, and several prominent yeomen belonging to a farmer's association, the Bar Zamindar Association, initiated a sytematic protest against the bill. Colonists held mas meeting and signed memorials denouncing the government proposals. Many of the meetings centred in the newly developed Gugera branch, where harsh residency and sanitation regulations as well as water scarcity had cut most deeply into the colonists' faith in British intentions.[39] On 29 January, for example, a meeting was held at Sangla with an estimated attendance of 3,000 highly indignant colonists. They passed resolutions attacking alternation of previous contracts, protested against 'illegalities committed by local officers in imposing and recovering coercive fines and penalties amounting to lakhs of rupees' and suggested that 'the same should be refunded and the repetition stopped.'[40]

The agitation was unlike any other agitation previously witnessed in the Punjab. The local government had for the first time aggrieved a large portion of the rural population, and in response the Chenab zamindars and their sympathizers organized mass demonstrations. The unrest was not limited to the colony. The leading agricultural families of the central districts who had relatives in the colony or aspired to a future grant added their voice to the protests. Disaffection also penetrated the Indian army. Ex-government servants or educated Punjabis living in the colony headed the agitation, not urban politicians. Ram Chand, a Lyallpur lawyer and landowner, Shahab-ud-Din, a Muslim lawyer with a yeomen grant, and Siraj-ud-Din Ahmad, a retired postal officer, led the Zamindar Association meetings. They sent out printed invitations before each meeting, released news to the local press, and got several rich yeomen to donate a 'war chest' to support colonists who refused to pay fines.[41] The *Zamindar* was in

39. Reports of meetings in *Civil and Military Gazette*, 13 and 31 January, 1907; Popham Young note, Minto to Morley, 3 July, 1907; G. De Montmorency minute, 28 March, 1907, GI Revenue, October 1907, 13-25A.

40. *Tribune*, 1 February, 1907.

charge of publicity. The paper's editor was particularly adroit at printing and distributing cartoons and literature appealing to the generally illiterate colonists. An example of the effective propaganda was a picture of an openmouthed alligator labelled 'Colonization Act' preparing to swallow terrified and befuddled colonists.[42] Besides being a rural movement, the agitaion was also differentiated from past political activity because of its non-communal nature. Hindus and Muslims were equally affected by the bill and mixed freely in protest meetings. Even the *Observer*, perennial critic of Muslim participation in politics, censured the measure as 'shaking public confidence' and called for demonstrations.[43] The culmination of this show of communal unity was a resolution passed on 3 February by 10,000 colonists at Layallpur, the capital of the colony. The resolution called on Hindus and Muslims to refrain from acts offensive to the other community and to unite against British *zaloom* (oppression).[44]

Representatives from the Lahore Indian Association, a branch of the Indian National Congress, attended the Lyallpur meeting. Headed by Lajpat Rai, a leader of a Hindu revivalist sect called the Arya Samaj, the urban politicians came as spectators and had no role in planning the agitation.[45] The presence of Lajpat Rai and his associates at the rural demonstration, however, convinced the Punjab Government that they had masterminded the entire agitation. It therefore resolved that the rural areas were not seriously upset over the measure and passed the bill through the legisaltive mill. Rivaz was determined to pass the bill before his retirement in March, and forced the Select Committee to present a report without giving it time to study the accumulating number of protests and memorials. Serveral Punjabi members of the Committee did not even have a chance to meet the amending body before it presented the report. Rushed by Rivaz and dominated by official members, the Select Committee made no sig-

41. De Montmorency minute, 28 March, 1907; minutes by A. Diack (2 April, 1907), A. Kettlewell (17 April, 1907), notes attached to FCF 441/108 A. Also comments in *Punjabee* 12 December, 1906; *Tribune*, 4 November, 1906.
42. *Zamindar*, 8 April, 1907, *SPVP* 1907, pp. 102-103.
43. *Observer*, 9 March, 1907, *SPVP* 1907, p. 65.
44. Reports in *Tribune*, 7 February, 1907; *Punjabee*, 6 February, 1907.
45. Lajpat Rai *Autobiographical Writings of Lajpat Rai*, ed. by V. C. Joshi, Delhi. 1965, pp. 119-20; Lajpat Rai, to G. K. Gokhale, 29 January, 1907, *Gokhale Collection* (Friends of India Society, on permanent loan to the National Archives of India, New Delhi).

nificant alterations in the legislation.[46] In the heated debate the government claim that the bill was being 'misrepresented' by 'some who claim to reflect and direct public opinion.' The three Punjabi members of the Council disagreed and demanded a postponement of the debate, but Rivaz called for an immediate vote, and the bill passed with the aid of the official majority.

Having convinced itself that urban agitators engineered the rural demonstrations, the Punjab Secretariat assumed that the unrest would immediately subside. The Financial Commissioner confidently prepared draft notifications to be distributed as soon as the Indian Government formally approved the Punjab's final venture into paternal legislation. Approval was considered a matter of form because the two governments had corresponded over the principles of the bill since 1902.[47] To the dismay of the Punjab Government, however, the agitation spread and became more virulent. Urban politicians helped the rural leaders prepare fresh demonstrations to influence the Government of India in its final decision on the bill. They called a monster meeting on the occasion of a livestock show at Lyallpur on the 22 and 23 of March and publicized the affair with printed invitations and eight-page pamphlets in Punjabi accusing the British of treachery.[48] The Lieutenant Governor realized a week before the meeting that he had at least partially misjudged the seriousness of the agitation and attempted to conciliate the colonists with a notification defining the aims and the limitations of the act. Supposedly the circular would remove the half truths being spread 'by outside agitators.' The circular had the opposite effect, for the organizers of the meeting painted the action as a weak attempt to gloss over the real intentions of the bill.[49] Approximately 9,000 colonists gathered at Lyallpur to protest against 'government tyranny.' A Local editor, Prabh Dyal, opened the programme with an inflammatory poem entitled *Pagri Sambhal O Jatta* (Oh Jat, take care of the turban). The turban

---

46. Rivaj minute, 18 January, 1906, printed notes, FCF 441/108, A. Discussion of bill from proceedings of legislative council, Vol. I, pp. 178-82.
47. Douie minute. 5 April, 1907, and noting, FCF 441/108A. Under the Indian Councils Act the Viceroy had to assent to a local act before it come into operation. *Practice and Procedure of the Indian Government*, Calcutta, 1913, pp. 177-80.
48. Reports in *Zamindar*, 24 March, 1907, *SPVP* 1907, p. 97; *Punjabee*, 20 April, 1907, *Civil and Military Gazette*, 19 March, 1907.
49. Notification of 13 March, 1907, and sec. noting, FCF 441/108A.

was a symbol of self-respect for the warlike Jat Zamindars, and the poem appealed to them to strengthen their resistance to the bill.[50] After a number of patriotic songs, Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh, a bitter revolutionist from Lahore, made the major speeches. Lajpat Rai attempted to be moderate, but as frequently happened with his speech-making, the crowd's frenzy drove him to use phrases and ideas verging on what the British termed 'sedition.' Lajpat Rai claimed that the colony belonged to the King, not his servants the civil service. The colonists should not quietly accept the ICS's dictates. If Punjabis abandoned the law courts, developed native industries, and took vows of unity, the British would have to back down.[51] Ajit Singh was less temperate. He spoke of the need for bloody sacrifice and demanded a boycott of all government posts. Colonists should also band together and not pay revenue.[52] Immediately after the meeting Lajpat Rai went on a lecture tour in the United Provinces, while Ajit Singh continued to roam the central districts whipping up enthusiasm for the anti-bill agitation and giving rousing speeches. He and his revolutionary friends hoped that the canal bill would be a tool with which they could spark an uprising against the British.[53]

There are no indications that Ajit Singh played a significant role in the canal bill agitation either before or after the March meeting, but he and his organization, the Anjuman-i-Muhibban-i-Watan (Society of Lovers of the Homeland) did engineer the demonstrations against the Bari Doab enhancements. A local zamindar association headed by Lahore aristocrats had already discussed the proposals, but serious organization of the Amritsar and Lahore farmers began only after Ajit Singh made their cause his cause. On 4 April he held a mass meeting of 12,000 zamindars.[54] Two days later Ajit Singh

50. Report in *Panjabee*, 27 March, 1907.
51. Lajpat Rai speech, appended to history sheet, GI Home-Political File, August 1907, 148-235A (hereinafter cited as 'Disturbances File'). Also *Autobiographical Writings*, pp. 112-22. Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh were enemies and had not planned the meeting or the agitation.
52. Ajit Singh's speech, appended to history sheet, 'Disturbances File.' Also Ajit Singh, 'Autobiography (unpublished ms., V. C. Joshi, National Archives of India), pp. 10-11.
53. Lajpat Rai history sheet, Ajit Singh history sheet, 'Disturbances File.' Also Ajit Singh autobiography, pp. 13-14.
54. Telegram in R & S 1036, 1907. It is unclear why Ajit Singh waited until April to agitate. Other papers and organizations had taken up the cry a month earlier.

was cordially provided with a larger audience by the annual convocation of the Singh Sabha (a Sikh religious organization with strong rural backing) in Lahore. At a meeting on 6 April he called on the zamindars to disobey all British commands. The colonists passed resolutions supporting a boycott of British goods and started a committee to ensure that no zamindar paid the new water rate. The price of disobedience was social ostracism by the offender's caste or a fine of Rs. 500.[55]

The British Response to Unrest in the Punjab

The new Lieutenant Governor of the Punjab, Denzil Ibbetson, was convinced that the agitation had been engineered by 'Lahore pleaders' and after taking office in early March he began to examine measures for stemming the protests.[56] His first step was the publication of a resolution postponing for a year the rate enhancements on the ground that crop conditions and plague made the increases unwise. This did not stop the agitation.[57] In fact, the unrest became more serious with riots in Amritsar, Lahore and Rawalpindi. Ibbetson then re-examined the situation and decided that the rural demonstrations, talk of sedition in the army, and rioting were the result of a secret plot to overthrow the British government. He consequently sent to the Viceroy, Lord Minto, a lengthy minute on the deteriorating political condition of the Punjab and requested extensive executive powers to quell a rebellion.[58] Sedition, according to Ibbetson, took two directions in the Punjab. First, Ajit Singh was trying to spread disaffection among the troops and the students and secondly the 'fomentors of unrest' were corrupting the 'yeomanry.' Ibbetson maintained that the Colonization Bill and Bari Doab agitation had been entirely worked up. The Arya Samaj, under the leadership of Ajit Singh and Lajpat Rai, had succeeded in getting the rural population to suspend revenue payments. The next step would be open revolt. Ibbetson therefore requested the power to ban public meetings, to seize presses, and to arrest individuals inciting zamindars not to pay revenue. He also asked that Ajit Singh and Lajpat Rai be

55. Ajit Singh history sheet and proceedings of the meeting, 'Disturbances File.' Meeting reports in *Tribune*, 11 April, 1907; *Panjabee*, 1 May, 1907.
56. Ibbetson to Minto, 23 March, 1907.
57. Resolution in *Civil and Military Gazette*, 28 April, 1907; comments in *Panjabee*, 1 May, 1907.
58. Ibbetson minute, in PG to GI, 695, 3 May, 1907, 'Disturbances File.'

deported 'to strike terror into the minds of those concerned'.[59]

Poor channels of communication contributed to Ibbetson's mistaken impression concerning an overall plot to overthrow the British. He had only just returned to the Punjab after an extended absence of fifteen years and, without personal knowledge, he was dependent largely upon his men and the CID (Criminal Intelligence Department) for assessment of the unrest. The local CID drew its news chiefly from informants who exaggerated and hoplessly confused what was actually happening. Ram Bhaj Datta, the conservative barrister who headed one of the Arya Samaj branches, was reported to have called on students to kill Englishmen. Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh, in fact antagonistic to one another, if not active enemies, were pictured as co-conspirators who organized the outbreaks through secret societies.[60] The district officer reports on which Ibbetson heavily relied for the minute were equally misinformed. The favourite method of assessing what had happened in the districts was to call in prominent Muslim or Hindu aristocrats and to ask them about the agitation. The Muslims not surprisingly accused the Hindus of spreading sedition and lies, while the Hindu aristocrats (who generally hated the liberal Arya Smaj and Lajpat Rai) said that the Aryas were behind the disturbances.[61] In one key district, Rawalpindi, an officer who hated lawyers and Arya Samajists, P. D. Agnew, wrongly charged five pleaders with planning the local riot under the direction of Lajpat Rai.[62]

Ibbetson also misjudged the situation because of his attitude towards political agitation. He believed that since the British had the 'contentment of the masses' as a basic goal, the zamindars would never turn against the rulers unless they had been misled. Rural agitation could never be genuine—it had to be engineered by urban

---

59. Ibbetson minute. The deportation were to be carried out under Regulation III of the 1818 Bengal Regulations, which gave the Governor-General in Council the right to deport Indians to a place in India or outside India on the grounds that they endangered the peace.

60. Drawn from the first three 'Information' telegrams sent to Morley. The telegrams were based on CID reports, principally those of 4, 5 and 6 May (in appendices to notes, 'Disturbances File').

61. Enclosures to PG to GI, 695, 3 May,' 1907, 'Disturbances File. Also Ibbetson to Maclagan, printed notes, FCF 441/108A.

62. Agnew letter to PG, 8 May, 1907, GIPOL (Home-Political), July 1907, 8A. Agnew was an intimate friend of Ibbetson.

politicians for uncrupulous reasons.[63] Ibbetson would not admit that the Colonization Bill was a real grievance. He felt that intervention in the canal colonies was necessary for the good of the people, just as necessary as the Alienation Bill of which he had personally been the author.[64]. To question the government once it had carefully weighed an administrative decision was pure and simple sedition. A patriarchal ruler schooled in the Punjab tradition of the 'iron fist', Ibbetson was singularly incapable of differentiating between 'constitutional agitation' such as public meetings and methods such as rioting and inciting troops to mutiny. Any challenge to authority and British *izzat* (Honour and standing) was treason and must be met with absolute repression.[65]

Ibbetson's minute was totally unexpected. Minto and Lord Kitchener, the Commander in Chief of the Indian Army, had seen reports of rumoured sedition and tampering with the loyalty of the native troops, but they had not imagined that the Punjab situation was as critical as Ibbetson portrayed.[66] Minto could not legally give the Lieutenant Governor the powers he requested without the consent of his Executive Council and so he circulated the Punjab letter and called a meeting for 6 May.

Personal relations and the time-honoured principle of supporting the man on the spot eventually resulted in the Council's approval of the deportation of Ajit Singh and Lajpat Rai. The Council had little information except for the Punjab letter and its enclosures. The local government had been able to support its case only with a few reports of speeches, history sheets of Lajpat Rai and Ajit Singh, and excerpts from district officer correspondence. Because the Imperial

63. Ibbetson to PG, 7 March, 1889, GI Judical, December 1891, 234-300A; Ibbetson to Minto, 23 March, 1907.

64. Ibbestson minute, 26 April, 1907, printed notes FCF 441/108A KW ; PG to GI, 22 January, 1906, and Ibbetson note, 10 February, 1906, GI Revenue, May 1906, 43-44A.

65. As Minto later observed, 'Ibbetson appears to me to entirely misunderstand the position. He appears to assume that we can stamp out the unrest. This we can never do. It has come to stay, in the shape of new ideas and aspirations of which everyone who has thought seriously over the subject ought to be aware. He confused this with sedition ...', Minto to Morley, 5 November, 1907.

66. Minto to Morley, 16 May, 1907; Kitchener to Minto, 5 May, 1907; Minto to Lord Roberts, 6 June, 1907.

CID was prevented by statute from collecting information within the areas falling under the jurisdiction of the provincial governments, the CID and the Council were virtually dependent upon the Punjab police agency for news and analysis.[67] The problem was whether to trust Ibbetson's interpretation and back the Punjab Government on the basis of skimpy material, or not to heed the plea for urgency and call for a detailed investigation. The stakes were high. The Punjab was the recruiting ground for more than a third of the Indian army. If disaffection had spread throughout the army or among families of soldiers, a revolt might be imminent.[68] Rumours of a pending military uprising were particularly rampant, for 10 May was the fiftieth anniversary of the 1857 Mutiny. On the other hand, deportation and extension of executive power would, as one Council member noted, create 'great commotion' in parliament and among Indian politicians whom Minto was trying to woo with constitutional reform.[69] Edward Baker, the future Lieutenant Governor of Bengal and a liberal friend of Surendranath Banerjea, distrusted Ibbetson and urged his fellow Council members to oppose the Punjab request. Harvey Adamson also challenged the Punjab case for deportation and suggested instead a stronger sedition law. Erle Richards, a close friend of Ibbetson, maintained that he alone must be the judge of the situation. Minto's chief advisors, Kitchener and Herbert Risley, the Home Secretary, urged full support for the local government.[70] Minto had two personal reasons for initially defending Ibbetson's demand. Ibbetson had been a close associate of the Viceroy, and Minto believed that he knew more about the Punjab, and possibly India, than any other civil servant.[71] Moreover, his judgment was influenced by the earlier decision not to back Fuller, the Lieutenant Governor of East Bengal and Assam. Fuller, had bullied Bengali nationalists and aggravated political tension by banning schools connected with agitation from participation in the Calcutta University examinations. When John Morley, the Liberal

---

67. *Punjab CID Manual*, Lahore, 1915, pp. 7-8, 43.
68. Approximately 30,000 Sikhs (23 per cent. of the army) and 18,000 Punjab Muslim (13 per cent. of the army) were in the army in 1907. Statistics from *Indian Army List, 1907*.
69. Erle Richards minute, 5 May, 1907, 'Disturbances File.'
70. Adamson minute (5 May), Baker minute (6 May), Finlay minute (6 May), Kitchener minute (6 may), 'Disturbances File.' Also Minto to Lady Minto, 9 May, 1907, Minto to Morley, 8 May, 1907.

Secretary of State, attacked Fuller, Minto first defended his 'man on the spot', but subsequently decided that 'imperial interests' were threatened by this 'dangerous man' whose retention would produce a 'conflagration.'[72] Ibbetson had been an intimate friend of Fuller and defended him with the argument that if the local government were not supported, the prestige of every Bengal civil servant would be impaired. Ibbetson noted that as future Leiutenant Governor of the Punjab he might be 'confronted by a state of things similar to that which Sir B. Fuller has to face.' If Fuller were not backed, Ibbetson said he feared the Government of India would not stand behind his government.[73] After lengthy correspondence with Ibbetson, who tried to convince his chief that a resignation would be a 'political blunder', Minto finally forced Fuller to resign.[74] While Minto's decision shocked Ibbetson, he had been touched by the Viceroy's profuse assurances that his opinion was highly valued. Minto promised Ibbetson full support in whatever action he might have to take in the Punjab.[75] Mindful of his promise and the dangers inherent in frequent failure to back the subordinate governments, Minto convinced Adamson and Baker that the Punjab evidence justified deportation. Risley prepared a carefully worded telegram drawn heavily from the Ibbetson minute, the Council approved it, and the telegram was sent to Morley and the India Council in London.[76] The Executive Council notified Morley two days later that in addition to deportation it planned to extend an ordinance on public meetings to selected Punjab districts. The ordinance empowered a magistrate to cancel a meeting without announcing his reason. Plans for meetings had to be given to the government seven days in advance, and persons planning or attending illegal meetings were subject to six months' imprisonment.[77]

John Morley had been following events in the Punjab with great interest. The exaggerated Reuter report on riots in Rawalpindi

71. Minto to Morley, 8 May, 1907.
72. Minto to Valentine Chirol, 18 May, 1910.
73. Ibbetson to Minto, 25 June, 1906.
74. Richards Diary, 6 August, 1906. *Richards Collection* (Eur. Mss. F. 122, India Office Library).
75. Ibbetson to Minto, 21 and 24 July, 1906; Minto to Ibbetson, 21 and 23 July, 1906.
76. Order in Counsil, 6 May, 1907, and 8 May telegram, 'Disturbances File.'
77. H. Risley minute, 11 May, 1907, 'Disturbances File.'

aroused his fear that the Indian Government might do something hasty, and he telegraphed Minto on 6 May not to take any steps without consultation.[78] The telegram crossed with the news of the deportation of Lajpat Rai. Morley was 'suspicious' of the decision, but trusting Ibbetson and lacking first-hand information, he supported Minto.[79] The telegram on the meeting ban arrived on 10 May. Morley angrily threw the message down, screaming 'No, I can't stand that : *I will not have that*.' His private secretary and advisor, F. A. Hirtzel, convinced him that the home authorities were obligated to back Minto during the emergency or until they received a detailed report. Morley bitterly acquiesced.[80]

In the Punjab Ibbetson was frantically trying to calm the European population and to pacify the zamindars. Officers held darbars in each district and explained the Colonization Act. Because the colonists and agriculturists felt they had been wronged, however, they continued to hold meetings and draft petitions.[81] With meetings banned in five major districts, the urban agitations quietened. While corresponding with Minto about further executive power and reassuring the zamindars of government intentions, Ibbetson discovered that his persistent lip ulcer was malignant. Ibbetson informed Minto that he must leave immediately for London to consult specialists; he hoped he would be able to return in three months.[82] Minto agreed and appointed Gordon Walker, the senior Punjab officer, as acting Lieutenant Governor. With Ibbetson gone and an inexperienced and untested subordinate holding the reigns, initiative for further action in pacifying the Punjab passed to Minto and his Council.[83] After the departure of Ibbetson, the Government of India considered a move from coercion to conciliation.

Minto continued to believe for several days following the deportation that the disturbances were part of a sinister plot. Police informants in the Punjab—whose continued employment in effect depended upon their ability to unearth or to fabricate sedition—sent in incredible

78. Telegram to Minto, 6 May, 1907.
79. Hirtzel Diary, 8 May, 1907, Home Misc. Series 864, India Office Library; Morley to Minto, 9 May, 1907.
80 Hirtzel Diary, 10 May, 1907.
81. Printed circular, 7 May, 1907, and noting by FC Secretariat, PG Revenue (Printed) 108A; CID report, 13 June, 1907, West Pakistan CID Archives, Punjab CID Report of 1907.
82. Ibbetson to Minto, 13 May, 1907.
83. Minto to Morley, 18 June, 1907; Minto to Lady Minto, 15 May, 1907.

tales of pending mutiny and an Afghan-Russian-Punjabi entente to seize the border districts. The Home Department unquestioningly sent the reports to Morley.[84] At approximately the time of Ibbetson's departure, however, the Home Department Secretariat and the Viceroy began to suspect that much of the Punjab information was inaccurate. Minto balked at emphasis upon a Russian plot in a telegram of 17 May, for example, while the embarrassed Home Department Secretariat frequently had to admit that much of the supporting evidence sent home to London had been alarmist.[85] Kitchener decided to send out his own investigators to determine the depth and causes of disaffection among Punjabi soldiers. The officers talked with the sepoys and found that existing tension was due primarily to the Colonization Bill, which had affected either soldiers or their families. On the basis of these reports and scattered memorials from Punjabi soldiers, Kitchener urged Minto to veto the controversial measure. Obviously press laws and deportation alone would not strike at the root of military unrest.[86]

Minto had begun to weigh the vetoing of the bill before receiving Kitchener's suggestion. Nevertheless, he postponed final judgement until his Council could note on the issue. The Revenue Secretary and a former Punjab man, James Wilson, vehemently defended the legislation, maintaining that 'most colonists' were not disturbed by the new restrictions. Even if they were, the 'colonists who have been brought from narrow poverty in their old homes and placed, by the beneficence of Government, in a position of prosperity, unimagined in their fondest dreams,' had no 'legal or moral right' to the land.[87] The Revenue Member, Miller, claimed that Minto must support the men on the spot, but admitted that assent to the bill might accelerate disaffection.[88] Minto was confused by the issues and alternatives,

84. CID report, 15 May, 1907, and resulting telegram, 16 May, 1907, GIPOL, July 1907, 29-117B. Risley, the Home Secretary, also perpetuated the mistakes because he believed that Punjabis and Bengalis had joined in an all-India plot.
85. Minto minute, 17 May, 1907, telegram to Morley, 12 May, later corrected by 21 May telegram and Punjab demi-official letter, 19 May, 1907, GIPOL, July 1907, 29-117B. The latter issue was over a Reuter telegram which the Punjab somehow used as a source of news for what was happening. The telegram claimed that thousands of 'rustics' had invaded Lahore.
86. Kitchener to Minto, 12 May, 1907. Also memorials to Kitchener, in appendix to GI Leg., June 1907, 4-8A.
87. Wilson minute, 4 May, 1907, GI Leg., June 1907, 4-8A.
88. Miller minute, 6 May 1907, GI Leg., June 1907, 4-8A.

and therefore he called for fresh noting by all members of his council [89]

Minto was in difficult position. The final decision on assent was his alone, for under the India Councils Act the Governor-General and not the Governor-General in Council had the power and the responsibility to accept or reject local legislation.[90] There were growing indications that the Punjab situation did not resemble the image presented in the Punjab correspondence. On the other hand Minto still respected Ibbetson's opinion, and just before leaving India Ibbetson had warned that a veto would only open the path for further demands. Realizing that Minto was considering a veto, however, Ibbetson suggested a compromise. The Lieutenant Governor was empowered by section 35 of the Act to suspend the measure in notified areas. Ibbetson proposed that he suspend the Act immediately after assent, thus giving both governments further opportunity to investigate the charges against the legislation without undermining the *izzat* of the local authorities.[91] Weighing against Ibbetson's offer was Kitchener's demand that only a veto would stop disaffection among his soldiers.[92] Morley also favoured a veto. He had consulted with T.W. Holderness, the India Council revenue specialist, and Hirtzel, and then telegraphed Minto that an assent would be 'impolitic'.[93] The additional material coming into the Secretariat summer office at Simla tended to support such action. For example, Minto received a Punjab revenue letter with enclosures suggesting that the colonists themselves had organized the demonstrations and were sincerely afraid of the bill.[94]

Minto wrote Morley on 16 May that a veto would be preferable to compromise. The Government of India had to act decisively to regain the trust of the Punjabi rural class. He privately informed his wife a day earlier that the bill was in his opinion a gross mistake. Although Ibbetson and perhaps other local governments would denounce the Indian Government's refusal to support subordinates, 'it is a question whether it may not be better for me to "play to the gallery" for now, and disallow the Act off my own bat on the grounds

89. Minto minute, 14 May, 1907, GI Leg., June 1907, 4-8A.
90. *Practice and Procedure of the Government of India*, pp. 29-30.
91. Ibbetson to Minto, 14 May, 1907.
92. Kitchener to Minto, 12 May, 1907.
93. Morley telegram to Minto, 14 May, 1907; Hirtzel Diary, 14 May, 1907.
94. Enclosures to PG to GI, 60 RS, 29 April, 1907, GI Revenue, October 1907, 13-28A.

that the occasion is so urgent one must do something to impress upon the Native mind as to our fair play.'[95]

The Executive Council argued heatedly over the issue of veto. Wilson's defence of the Act was so impassioned that Minto completely discounted his opinion.[96] Miller called for a fresh investigation, while Baker denied that any legitimate reason existed for postponing settlement of the matter. Baker added that because the Punjab Government rushed the bill and made no effort to weigh public opinion, he was 'out of sympathy' with defending their action or their *izzat*. Adamson noted cynically that the Act was arbitrary, 'but this was the usual nature of Punjab Government agricultural legislation.' Finlay urged backing the man on the spot. Kitchener claimed that the image of British justice required the veto of 'a poor piece of legislation.' Ibbetson's friend, Richards, concluded the noting by supporting assent, suspension of the Act, and a thorough inquiry.[97]

Minto weighed the opinions for five days and then vetoed the Act on 26 May. Despite his personal attachment to and sympathy with Ibbetson, he decided to risk weakening the power of the provincial government in order to regain the loyalty of the Punjab rural population and the Punjab contingent in the army. Minto based his minute of veto upon the earlier minutes of Baker and Kitchener, whom he considered to be the best men on the Council. The Governor-General said the bill was so poorly worded and the principles so questionable that for the first time the politically inert Punjab had been torn by agitation.[98] Acting decisively 'to impress the public imagination with the absolute justice of our intentions', Minto denied the accusation that he was giving way to agitators. The bill was a bad one, and the Government of India dare not back the mistaken policies of subordinate officials :

> My grounds for refusing assent are based on the belief that we have found ourselves about to be committed to the approval of a very faulty piece of legislation— legislation which would be inadvisable at any time, but which at the present moment, if it

95. Minto to Lady Minto, 15 May, 1907.
96. Minto to Morley, 16 May, 1907; Wilson minute, 14 May, 1907; Minto minute, 7 July, 1907; GI Revenue, October 1907, 13-28A.
97. Minuting, 14-20 May, 1907, GI Leg., June 1907, 4-8A.
98. Minto to Lady Minto, 20 June, 5 July, 1907. Official minute, 26 May, 1907, GI Leg., June 1907, 4-8A.

became law, would add fuel to the justifiable discontent which has already been caused—whilst the appearance of surrender to agitation, should any portions of the public entertain such reasoning, would in my opinion be far less dangerous than to insist upon enforcing the unfortunate legislation upon a warlike and loyal section of the Indian community.[99]

Minto's minute was clearly written for publication. The protests of the Punjab Government and Wilson made the Viceroy change his mind, however, and all the public saw of the intense ten-day debate was the simple fact that the Colonization Bill would not become law.[100]

The Punjabi agriculturists' response to the veto was instantaneous. The Punjab vernacular press and resolutions from public meetings praised the action as a vindication of British justice. The zamindars did not understand how or why the bill had been repealed —they only knew that the threat had been removed. Many attributed the veto to a change of heart by Denzil Ibbetson. Ibbetson returned in August to find himself a hero. As the *Zamindar* observed, contributions were even collected to build a statue to the Lieutenant Governor in Lyallpur.[101] When the former Colonization Officer, now Settlement Commissioner, Popham Young, visited the Chenab colony ten days after the veto, he was greeted with garlands and pledges of undying loyalty. The Bar Zamindar Association and the pleaders who led the agitation apologized for their action and praised the integrity of the British government.[102] In his subsequent report on the colony, Popham Young confirmed that the burst of loyalty toward the British raj was sincere. Nevertheless, he warned that the rulers must now study conditions in the colony and remove perennial grievances. The veto had prevented an explosion, but the government had the further task of determining long-range policy toward the colonists and the Bari Doab rates.[103] Minto accordingly called, for a thorough investigation. A commission of inquiry would be called, he informed the Punjab Government, because 'there has been much, verging almost on the tyrannical, in the Government of the Punjab that calls for

99. Minto minute, 26 May, 1907, GI Leg., June 1907, 4-8A.
100. Punjab unofficial letter to GI, 5 June, 1907; Wilson minute, 10 June, 1907, Minto minute, 11 June, 1907, GI Leg., June 1907, 4-8A.
101. *Zamindar*, 1 June, 1937, *SPVP 1907*, p. 222. Also comments in *Tribune*, 15 June, 1907; H. Stuart minute, 2 July, 1907, GIPOL, August 1907, 113A.
102. Popham Young minute, enclosed in Minto to Morley, 3 July, 1907.
103. *Ibid.*

careful inquiry.[104] The Bari Doab question was also to receive attention. Ibbetson suspended the enhancement, but the matter had to be finally settled.

Aftermath of the Disturbances

The Government of India informed the local government in late May that it would call a committee consisting of a Punjab representative, a military officer, and a revenue officer from another province to study several issues connected with the Colonization Act and canal administration in general: the retrospective aspects of future legislation, the sufficiency of existing laws, penalties, and whether the rule by a colonization officer and his staff had been arbitrary and overbearing.[105] The officiating Lieutenant Governor wrote to Ibbetson and complained that Minto planned to judge the Punjab Government before the public He also informed the Indian Government that his administration did not require an investigation because the colony was a local problem. If the Government of India interfered, the prestige of the Punjab civil service would be further damaged. In no circumstances should a military man be on the committee.[106] The Punjab reply sparked another Council debate. The Viceroy and his associates almost unanimously agreed to overrule the local government in view of the mounting evidence of maladministration. Baker, Adamson, and Miller vehemently demanded that the Punjab view of the matter be contested —as Adamson phrased the Council position, 'the other side of the shield' had to be seen.[107] Only Wilson persistently fought the decision with the argument that, but for outside agitators, there would have been no trouble. Minto had lost all patience with the Punjab point of view and sarcastically replied that the Indian Government was therefore indebted to the agitators. Since the Punjab Government did not know what was happening, he welcomed authentic information and advice from any source.[108] Despite its evident displeasure with the Punjab officials, however, the Council still hesitated at pushing the local government before the return of Ibbetson. Owing to Council pressure and his own mixed feelings towards the ailing head

104. Minto to Morley, 5 June, 1907; GI to PG, 1027, 29 May, 1907, GI Leg., June 1907, 4-8A.
105. GI to PG, 995/205-3, 24 June, 1907, GI Revenue, October 1907, 13-28A.
106 PG to GI, 882, 2 July, 1907, *ibid.* Also Ibbetson to Minto, 27 June, 1907.
107. Minutes by Miller (13 June), Baker (18 June), Adamson (19 June), *ibid.*
108. Minutes by Wilson (3 July), Minto (7 and 11 July), *ibid.* Also Minto telegram to Morley, 15 July, 1907.

of the government Minto agreed to suspend discussion about a committee for a month.[109] Ibbetson returned in August, and he and Minto reached a compromise. Minto sympathized with his plea that the Punjab Government should not be 'publicly arraigned and placed in the dock, on its trial, in its own province.'[110] The committee would therefore not judge past administration but only outline defects and indicate the direction for new legislation. Minto also agreed to keep the final report confidential.[111]

While the two governments spent months preparing a directive for the committee and choosing members acceptable to each other, Ibbetson appointed a small committee to study the water rate problem. The committee reported in January 1908 that much of the agitation had been justified by poor water supply, unwise judgments on increases, and crop failure. Future enhancements should be undertaken concurrently with revenue settlements and not separately. The government should fearlessly face the water distribution problem by stopping extension of the canal and ending reduction of water supply in existing branches. Even at the cost of revenue the British should honour the pledge to furnish water to zamindars currently relying upon irrigation.[112] The Punjab Government prepared draft resolution which incorporated most of the committee recommendations. The resolution stated that because of bad crops and water shortage, the enhancements would be dropped until the next revenue settlement.[113]

The Government of India accepted the committee's findings but refused to permit the local government to print their resolution. Miller and Minto felt that the real reason for cancelling the enhancements had been that they were defective. The local authorities were not prepared to admit this publicly, while the excuse about bad weather was on obvious falsehood: 'We have made a mistake; that is admitted in the Punjab letter; our attention has been called to it by agitation, and we mean to retrace our steps. The explanation

---

109 GI to PG, 1121, 15 July, 1907, *ibid.*

110. Ibbetson to Minto, 27 June, 1907; PG to GI, 1764S, 19 August, 1907, *ibid.*

111. PG to GI, 1764S, 19 August, 1907, GI to PG, 1380, 8 September, 1907; Minto minute, 31 August, 1907, *ibid.*

112. Report of committee, in PG to PG, 20 RI, 21 January, 1908, GI Revenue, June 1908, 15B.

113. Draft resolu ion in PG 20 RI, 21 January, 1908, *ibid.*

about bad seasons will deceive nobody.'[114] The Council agreed and ordered the Punjab Government to announce its decision without an explanation.[115]

A more significant reversal of policy soon followed. The Punjab Canal Colony Committee presented its report in the winter of 1908. The Committee had toured the central Punjab for several months, circulated questionnaires, interviewed over two hundred zamindars, and listened to complaints in large open air meetings. It found that agitation had disappeared, and the attitude of the colonists was now 'moderate.'[116] The Committee recommended that full proprietary rights be given to the colonists and that from 1909 onwards the *chaks* should be integrated into the regular administrative system. The colonists who were interviewed claimed that they previously considered themselves proprietors and wanted official title to their land. The Committee agreed. The Punjab Government could no longer expect to treat the colonies as a special preserve for experimentation and paternalism. When the colonists showed that they were good tenants, they should be given an opportunity to purchase the land. Afterwards the regular laws should cover them, not the patriarchal decisions of an officer unfettered by the courts.[117] Fines were preferable to expulsion, but the committee suggested relaxation of sanitary requirements. The ordinary laws of succession should also become operative. If a tenant died before acquiring property rights, the government should permit his heirs to take over the land. Finally, future administrators must protect the colonists from graft.

The Punjab Government understandably denounced the recommendations that colonists should own the land and that paternalism as a system of administration must be abandoned in the colonies. It argued that the British should remain the landlords and guardians of the people.[118] Minto's Councils, however, had finished listening to the local government and unanimously demanded a bill along the

---

114. Minutes by Miller (19 April), Minto (18 May), GI to PG, 1162-1, 25 May. 1908, *ibid*.

115. Order in Council, 20 May, 1908, *ibid*.

116. Report of committee, GI Revenue, April 1909, 1-4A. The remainder of the paragraph is drawn from this report.

117. This innovation had been anticipated and favoured by the Indian Revenue Department. For example, Miller minute, 13 June, 1907; Minto minute, 7 July, 1907; GI Revenue, October 1907, 12-28A.

lines suggested by the Committee.[119] Miller's comment on the Punjab attitude summarized the viewpoint of the entire Council :

> Are we to keep these colonies for ever as a sort of enclave in the province governed by special rules of its own ? Perhaps this might have been possible if the Punjab had not alarmed the colonists to such an extent by its system as to lead to a very serious agitation. That point having been reached there seems to me to be nothing for it, but to place the colonists on the same footing as far as may be as their brethren in the districts from which they have come.[120]

The Council's disgust with the Punjab revenue and administrative ideas was also reflected in the noticeable change within the personnel of the Imperial Revenue Department. From the appointment of Denzil Ibbetson to the Revenue Secretariat in 1894 until the retirement of James Wilson in late 1907, the Department had been 'Punjabized.' The series was broken sharply and self-consciously in 1907, and Punjab officers never again regained their once prominent position in Indian revenue affairs.[121]

The Punjab pushed its ideas on administration to the breaking point. The resulting agitation caused the Government of India to denounce patriarchal rule, and it also cost the Punjab a hold on revenue policy. Without a single spokesman on the Executive Council, the local government had to accept the dictates of the Viceroy and his associates. A new committee prepared a bill closely resembling the recommendations of the previous committee. Colonists could buy land rights after fifteen years residence, penal codes were lightened, and residency requirements were abolished for all yeomen tenants. Revenue decisions could be appealed to the civil courts.[122] The Punjab vainly fought the decision, but eventually the bill reached the local legislative council in the revised form. Following a brief and non-controversial introduction of the bill, it was sent to a select

---

118. PG to GI, 2141S, 21 August, 1908, GI Revenue, April 1909, 14-A.
119. Order in Council, 15 January, 1909, and prior noting, *ibid*. The death of Ibbetson and the elimination of his influence on the council undoubtedly strengthened its attitude toward the Punjab authorities.
120. Miller minute, 4 January, 1910, GI Revenue, May 1910, 10-12A.
121. Adamson minute, 19 June, 1907, GI Revenue, October 1907, 13-28A. Also Minto to Morley, 3 July, 1907.
122. Committee report, PG to GI, 633S-RA-1, 23 June, 1909, GI Revenue, December 1909, 10-11 A.

committee and circulated for almost two years. As the new Lieutenant Governor, Louis Dane, commented upon its enactment in 1912, 'all possible suggestions' had been incorporated into the final act.[123] A measure formulated in 1902, the cause of rural unrest in the Punjab, and the source of endless controversy and intra-government manoeuvring, finally became law.

Concluding Remarks

A serious failure of communication between ruler and ruled and between the Indian and Punjab Governments lay at the bottom of the 1907 disturbances. The local authorities made a number of administrative blunders without attempting to gauge the effect of the measures and without explaining official intentions. The Government of India was normally a check against such mistakes, but in the canal colony affair it defended the local government because of Punjab influence on the Executive Council. Rivaz and Ibbetson saw no reason to consult Punjabis about administrative matters or legislation. Living in an administrative ethos inherited from the days of John Lawrence, they assumed that since the British knew what was right for the zamindar, he would, as in the past, accept the dictate unquestioningly. This assumption blinded the Punjab Government to spreading unrest. When the unrest pressed itself on Ibbetson's attention in the form of demonstrations, rioting, and disaffection in the Indian army, the Lieutenant Governor could not differentiate between real grievances and the efforts of Ajit Singh. He unintentionally misled Minto and his Council. Minto initially supported Ibbetson because he did not have first-hand information on the agitation. His Council's first reaction was to honour the principle of backing the man on the spot. Minto's relationship with Ibbetson and Ibbetson's friendship with several Council members significantly reinforced this tendency. Upon receipt of better information, however, it became evident that the Punjab authorities had muddled the affair. The resulting debate over possible remedies brought into focus the conflicting assumptions and goals of the two governments. The Punjab believed an admission of failure would irrevocably weaken its authority and intensify the unrest. Minto and his Council, on the other hand, realized that the unrest was genuine and threatened the army. Minto placed more importance upon reviving the zamindar's faith in British integrity and goodwill than upon a possible weakening of local influence. Still with-

123. *Proceedings of the Punjab Legislative Council*, 1912, p. 103.

out full information on the agitation or the causes for the demostrations, Minto agonizingly decided on a veto. His judgement proved correct, and the rural unrest subsided.

The handling of the disturbances was one in a series of incidents in the daily task of governing the British Empire in India. It illustrates that when the Governor-General and his Council possessed information suggesting that a grievance was real and threatened the peace of a region, they were ready to remove the source of discontent at any cost. No price was too large to pay for the political stability of the sub-continent, nor the price of forcing a subordinate government to lose face nor the price of vetoing plans for rural reconstruction. Whether the Punjab programme of paternalism and agrarian reform would have helped significantly towards preventing the growing indebtedness in the province was irrelevant to Minto and the Executive Council. The Punjab had pushed too hard, and the Government of India backed down in the face of the resulting agitation.

Three lessons emerged from the 1907 experience. First, Morley never again fully trusted the Indian Government. Its mistakes over the disturbances exposed him to a year of parliamentary ridicule. Thereafter the vain Secretary of State with pronounced liberal leanings scrutinized every act of repression suggested by Minto and frequently vetoed his plans. The Government of India also became wary of report from subordinate agencies and governments. It particularly watched the Punjab Government for several years and prevented local authorities from putting patriarchal principles into practice. Secretariats, Councils and Viceroys frequently changed, however, and the mistakes of 1907 were gradually forgotten. That the supreme government eventually relaxed the grip on the Punjab during the First World War helps to explain how Michael O'Dwyer—the man so closely resembling Ibbetson that the dying Lieutenant Governor suggested him as a successor—was able to establish a reign of terror in 1919. The third and most vital lesson went unheeded. The government continued to ignore the problem of trying to rule India with faulty channels of communication. On the one hand this meant that the British were unable to explain fully their goals and intentions, with the result, as in the 1907 disturbances, that rumour and the spread of suspicion threatened to create unrest. The fears of the colonists effectively prevented further attempts to improve their lot, just as breaks in communication and misunderstanding contribut-

ed to the failure of land reform and the limited success of the agricultural banks programme. The British were also frustrated in their efforts to look behind the native curtain, to assess the views of the Indian people and their probable response to official action. This lack of basic information was particularly important as the British tried to counter the growing force of Indian nationalism. Although the CID became more efficient, the Government of India continued to rely upon subordinate agencies and governments for news and political reports. Because at each level of administration there was opportunity for personal bias and misinterpretation, the type of mistakes made in 1907 were to be repeated again and again. More often than not, however, the Viceroy and the local authorities corrected the mistakes before they sparked a conflagration. Frequently cut off from actual events, the men who ruled India made command decisions based upon inadequate information—the Indian empire in the last analysis rested upon their ability to make an educated guess.

The Round Table Movement and India, 1909-1920

DEWITT CLINTON ELLINWOOD, JR.*

When in 1909 a small group of former members of Lord Milner's 'Kindergarten' and a few like-minded British imperialists formed the Round Table group, India was scarcely considered.[1] They were concerned with the changes in the 'white' Dominions and with the growing challenges to Britain's world power. As believers in the Empire they thought that the only sure path to a sound future lay in 'closer union' of the self-government portions of the Empire. To this end they conceived of a new Imperial Government which would take over from the Westminster Parliament both the foreign policy of the British Empire and the supervision of government in India and the other dependencies.[2] Conservative in political viewpoint, these men were strong believers in British imperial leadership and responsibility. Drawn from the traditional British governing classes, they believed strongly in the superiority of British civilisation and felt a sense of 'trusteeship' for the Empire.

In striking contrast to this indifference of 1909-10, by 1915 the Round Table central committee or 'Moot' in London had become

---

* State University of New York at Albany, U S.A.

1. On the Round Table movement see: W. Nimocks, *Milner's Young Men: The 'Kindergarten' in Edwardian Imperial Affairs* (Durham NC, 1968). John Kendle: 'The Round Table Movement, New Zealand, and the Imperial Conference of 1911', *3 Journal of Commonwealth Political Studies* (1965), 104-17; 'The Round Table Movement: Lionel Curtis and the formation of the New Zealand groups in 1910', I *The New Zealand Journal of History* (1967), 33-50; 'The Round Table Movement and "Home Rule All Round"', II *The Historical Journal* (1968), 332-53. J. Eayrs, 'The Round Table Movement in Canada, 1909-1920', *38 The Canadian Historical Review* (1957), 1-20. C. Quigley, 'The Round Table Groups in Canada, 1908-1938', 43 *ibid.* (1962), 204-24. L. Curtis, *The Round Table Movement: Its Past and Future* (Toronto, 1913). The best study for placing the Round Table Movement in the broad context of Indian policy is S. R. Mehrotra, *India and the Commonwealth*, 1885-1929 (London, 1965).
2. Minutes of the Round Table, 4-6 September, 1909, 15-18 January, 1910, in the Lothian Papers, GD 40/17/11, Scottish Record Office. These papers are a major source for Round Table history. I wish to thank the present Lord Lothian for permission to use the papers.

deeply involved in the consideration of possible radical changes in the Indo-British relationship and in Indian Government. This culminated in the Round Table playing an important role in the development and passage of the India Act of 1919. The purpose of this article is to examine the changes which took place in Round Table thought and activities concerning India upto 1920. Such a study is important because of the significance of that act and because it provides insights into the movement of British imperial opinion about India during this critical period.

Although Lord Milner was the most distinguished figure in the group. the actual leadership lay in the hands of younger men, especially Lionel Curtis, organiser-cum-writer, and Philip Kerr (Lord Lothian), editor of *The Round Table*, 1910-16.[3] Other active members of the Moot were Lionel Hichens, Robert Brand (Lord Brand), (Sir) Dougal Malcolm, G. L. Craik, Edward Grigg (Lord Altrincham), F.S. Oliver, and later, (Sir) Reginald Coupland, and Waldorf Astor (Lord Astor).[4] However some of these men—Oliver and Astor in particular—never evinced any significant interest in India.

---

3. Because Kerr was frequently ill, Brand and Oliver edited the journal in 1912-13; in June 1913 Grigg was appointed joint editor with Kerr. Previously in South Africa, Kerr had been editor of *The State*, a journal founded primarily by the Kindergarten. See J. R. M. Butler, *Lord Lothian (Philip Kerr), 1882-1940* (London, 1960). Information has also been provided by Mr Dermot Morrah, former editor, *The Round Table*. No biography of Curtis has yet been published.
4. Hichens and Brand became businessmen on their return to England. Craik was Chief Constable, Metropolitan Police, 1910-1914. Dougal Malcolm was Secretary to Lord Grey, Governor-General of Canada, 1910-11; in 1913 he began a long career as Director of the British South Africa Company. Other persons who participated in the Moot during this period, for varying lengths of time, were Lords Lovat, Anglesey, and Salisbury, Lord Robert Cecil (Salisbury's son), Leopold Amery, Sir Arthur Steel-Maitland, Dr L. S. Jameson, Lord Howick (heir to Earl Grey, son-in-law of Lord Selborne), Lord Wolmer (son and heir of Lord Selborne, (Sir) Alfred Zimmern, (Sir) Herbert Baker, John, Dove, G.M. Paterson and R. E. Holland (this may have been R. M. Holland-Martin). Marris participated in the founding of the Round Table before returning to India in 1910. Amery was active in the founding of the Round Table, but he drifted away during the war. The Kindergarten contingent included Curtis, Kerr, Brand, Hichens, and Dove. Richard Feetham, (Sir) Patrick Duncan, and Hugh Wyndham (Lord Leconfield) remained in South Africa and founded the Round Table movement there. Although the Moot was made up of men, Lady Selborne and Nancy Astor (Lady Astor) often participated in Round Table discussions. The first extent list of the Moot is for 1913 (information from Mr Morrah).

Few of the men in the Moot had any significant ties with India, except Grigg and Amery, who were born there. Milner was once interested in the Viceroyalty but when he was offered it in 1905 he was too exhausted from his South African travail to accept it.[5] Occasionally Milner commented on Indian matters, as in 1907 when he called for the inclusion of Indian representatives in the Colonial Conference of that year and argued that the Dominions should accept a part in governing India and the other dependencies.[6] Lionel Hichens was a member of the Royal Commission on Decentralisation in India, 1907-09, which recommended further steps towards decentralisation.[7]

On the other hand the experiences of Lord Milner, Lord Selborne and the Kindergarten in South Africa had a distinctive influence on their thinking about India and the dependent Empire.[8] For most of these men it was their first significant contact with non-European peoples. Their main concern in this situation was to strengthen the British components of South African society *vis-a-vis* both the Boers and the non-Europeans. They also evoked a sense of trusteeship and a long-range aim of bringing non-Europeans up to the level of European civilisation. Furthermore they became acutely aware of the disruptive elements which developed when civilisations of redically different character came into contact. In the process of their

5. A. M Gollin, *Proconsul in Politics : A Study of Lord Milner in Opposition and in Power* (New York, 1964), 43-4 Milner served in the British administration in Egypt, 1889-92, and wrote *England in Egypt* (London, 1892). Herbert Baker joined Sir Edwin Lutyens as co-architect for New Delhi in 1912, but this apparently had no effect on Round Table interests in India.
6. Milner, 'Some Reflections on the Coming Conference', 49 *National Review* (1907), 206. Also see Milner, *Nation and Empire* (London, 1913), 289-99.
7. GB, Cd. 4360-69 (1908), East India Decentralisation (Royal Commission). *Report. Minutes of Evidence.*
8. L. M. Thompson, *The Unification of South Africa*, 1902-1910 (Oxford, 1960). B. Sacks, *South Africa : An Imperial Dilemma* (Albuquerque, New Mexico, 1967). W. K. Hancock, *Smuts : The Sanguine Years, 1870-1919* (Cambridge, 1962). Relevent statements by members of the group are : P. Duncan, 'The Asiatic Question in the Transvaal', I *The State* (1909), 159-74. Transvaal, Parliamentary Papers, T. G 13 (1908), *Report of the Transvaal Indigency Commission*, 1906-08; this was written by Kerr. Selborne, 'Notes on a Suggested Policy towards Coloured People and Natives', 9 January, 1908, in W.K. Hancock, ed., *Selections from the Smuts Papers*, II (Combridge, 1966), 374-94. Basil Williams, ed., *The Selborne Memorandum* (Oxford, 1925); this was the major statement of the Kindergarten and Selborne on South African Union.

work in South Africa members of the Kindergarten considered a variety of policies both for Africans and for Indians. When viewing the Indian community the Kindergarten felt an imperial responsibility for providing justice for subjects of the Crown but feared that additional immigration would discourage British immigration. As a result they helped develop a policy of restriction and near-exclusion of Indians in the Transvaal. In another connection Milner sought to use Indian labour to help get the Transvaal mining industry back into full production in 1903 but the Government of India refused to consider such a policy.[9] In sum the experience of these men in South Africa gave them an appreciation of some of the good qualities of Indians but presented them in the guise of a problem rather than a resource. Moreover the entire experience tended to emphasise the distinctive qualities of British civilisation.

An incidental but important aspect of the Kindergarten experience in South Africa was that there they first came into contact with James Meston (Lord Meston) and (Sir) William Marris, seconded from the Government of India. These men sowed the seeds of interest in India with the Kindergarten[10] and later they provided the Round Table's major contacts in India.

I

As it evolved in 1909-10, the Round Table movement consisted of a two pronged attack on the 'problem of Empire.' The private side of the movement consisted of a network of study groups in the Dominions and Britain, devoted to the study of the imperial problem, with the aim of developing an agreed plan for the future of the Empire. The public side was the publication of *The Round Table*, a journal, partly written in the Dominions and the dependencies, devoted to informing men living in various parts of the Empire about the other parts.

To provide a focus for the private study groups and to give direction to the study Lionel Curtis, following a visit to Canada in

9. GB, Cd. 1683 (1903), Transvaal and Orange River Colony. *Correspondence re Proposal for Indian Coolies on Railways.* Cd. 1684 (1903), Transvaal. *Correspondence re British Indians.*

10. L Curtis, *Papers relating to the application of the Principle of Dyarchy to the Government of India* (Oxford, 1920) (cited hereafter as *Dyarchy*), 38-42. This is the most important published source for the study of Round Table view on India, 1915-19.

1909-10, drafted a study of Canada and the Empire.[11] The burden of this privately circulated document, known as the 'Green Memorandum', was that the Empire was seriously threatened and that it must federate effectively or dissolve. In Curtis' a federation of the Empire must involve an Imperial Parliament and Cabinet. The memorandum had a strong sense of urgency, which encouraged Round Table preoccupation with the Dominions. Despite its neglect of the Dependencies, the memorandum expressed certain key ideas which were to have significance for future Round Table thinking about India. Therein Curtis was developing common interests and citizenship, characterised by freedom and self-government.[12] This implied that dependencies were developing towards self-government, as the Dominions had done, and that the ultimate in self-government would be mutual participation in the government of the Commonwealth as a whole. Pending the time when India and the dependencies were capable of self-government, the British must act as trustees, with the Dominions gradually sharing this trusteeship. Since he conceived of the Commonwealth as a community Curtis particularly deplored the isolation which kept Canadians and others from understanding India and its imperial importance. On the touchy question of the Asiatic immigration into the Dominions, Curtis expected that the Imperial Parliament would provide broad-based solutions, presumably favourable to India.

The Round Table and the Moot were never committed to the details of Curtis' vision of the future Commonwealth, though they shared many of his ideas. The journal concentrated on providing viewpoints from the various parts of the Empire and on supporting a generalised concept of closer union. Despite the modest Round

---

11. *Memorandum on Canada and the British Commonwealth* (London, 1910). It was reissued in 1912 with the inclusion of comments from Round Table groups and individuals; this edition was known as the 'Annotated Memorandum.' Subsequently it was published privately as *Round Table Studies* (First Series), I (London, 1914). Eventually Curtis published the Round Table studies under his own name because the Moot could not agree on his proposals : *The Problem of the Commonwealth* (London, 1915), *The Commonwealth of Nations* (London, 1916).
12. See, *e.g.*, *Commonwealth of Nations*, *II*, *Memorandum on Canada* (1912), 34; summary of his views in untitled typescript with accompanying letter to J. W. Porter, 27.6.12, Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/10 (titled 'The Genesis of India in the Round Table'), India Office Library. For permission to use material from the Meston Papers, I wish to thank the present Lord Meston.

Table interest in India before 1914, the journal printed a number of articles on that Imperial jewel.[13] Most of these articles were written in India, probably by members of the Indian Civil Service or by British journalists. They do not follow a clear line of policy, though they were all clearly British in viewpoint. Articles dealt with a variety of topics : Hindu-Muslim relationships (most frequently discussed), British and Dominion interests in India, education, and political movements. In 1914 an article on Indians in South Africa took a position more sympathetic to Indians than the Kindergarten had taken while in that country.[14] In general the Indian articles combined conservative views on political agitation and Indian participation in government with increasing sympathy for Indian interests.

Outside the Round Table movement itself *The Times* provided an additional forum for the Moot. Grigg was head of the imperial department, 1908-14, and Geoffrey Dawson was editor from August 1912 to February 1919. The Empire Day supplement of 24 May, 1911, edited by Grigg, centred on India. Its two central themes were British responsibility as trustee for the Indian people and the importance of India in Imperial strategic considerations. *The Times*' coverage of Indian news was extensive. In broad terms the paper was a strong supporter of British endeavour in India and was opposed to rapid political change.[15]

By contrast with *The Times*' interest in India, the Round Table members of Parliament paid almost no attention to India. None of its members (Milner, Salisbury, Lord Robert Cecil) participated in the debate on the Morley-Minto reforms in 1909. In 1912 Selborne spoke briefly on British work in India and on the problems posed

---

13. 'India and the English', 1 *The Round, Table* (cited hereafter as *RT*) (1911), 41-57. 'Hindus and Muhammedans', 1 *RT* (1911), 299-312. 'India', 2 *RT* (1912), 181-97. 'The Durbar and After', *ibid.*, 399-421. 'India and the Empire', *ibid.*, 587-626. 'India : Old Ways and New', 3 *RT*, (1913), 52-80. 'Political Crime in India', *ibid.*, 303-17. 'The Arya Samaj', *ibid.*, 614-36. 'Islam and the Empire', 4 *RT* (1914), 68-105. Also see 'Native States in India', 7 *RT* (1917), 91-113.

14. 'Indians and their South African Compatriots', 4 *RT* (1914), 463-83. *Cf.* 'South Africa. II: The Indian Problem', 10 *RT* (1920), 445-62.

15. Nimocks, *op. cit.*, 201-4; The Times, *The History of the Times*, IV (New York, 1952). From June 1913 Grigg was employed by both *The Round Table* and *The Times*.

by Indians in South Africa.[16] Such indifference can be explained mainly by preoccupation with the imperative domestic issues of the day. This basic lack of interest was not broken until the debates on the new India Bill in 1918-19. A few Parliamentary comments before 1918 emphasised their imperial and British viewpoints. During the war some of the men raised questions about the Mesopotamian fiasco, about poor facilities in India for British soldiers and dependents, and about German firms in India.[17]

Against the lively background of domestic and imperial questions in the pre-war years, it is surprising that by 1912 the Round Table was engaged in serious consideration of India's future in the Empire. This began with a tour of Europe and Asia made by Kerr in 1911-12. While spending two and a half months in India in 1912 Kerr became convinced that the Round Table must radically alter its approach to India because India could not be ignored in questions of imperial reorganisation. In April 1912 he wrote an article for *The Round Table* and a private Round Table memorandum setting forth his new views, writings which were seminal in the evolution of Round Table thinking about India. When these writings were circulated to the Moot the first major Round Table consideration of India was launched.[18] Kerr's article began by examining the history and civilisation of India. In his eyes Indian civilisation was unique but un-progressive, a

16 GB, *H. L. Debates :* 19.2.12, 65-70; 2.7.12, 307. In 1915 Selborne voted against the creation of an Executive Council in the United Provinces; *ibid.*, 16.3.15, 797-98.

17. GB, *H. L. Debates*; Selborne, 16.3.15, 800-1; 5.5.15, 927-34. Salisbury, 18.7.16, 760-62; 20.7.16, 870-72; 15.8.16, 56-7. *H. C. Debates :* Amery, 11.3.14, 1302. Astor, 17.7.16, 655; 1.8.16, 42; 20.7.16, 1266. *Cf.* Wolmer, 17.2.19, 532; 20.2.19, 1181; 30.7.19, 2130.

18. Curtis to Oliver *et al.*, 2.2.12; Curtis to Kerr, 2.3.12; both in Curtis Papers, Round Table Office. For permission to examine the Curtis Papers I am indebted to Mr Dermot Morrah. For permission to quote from them I wish to thank Sir Ivison Macadam, literary executor for Lionel Curtis' estate. Kerr to Paterson, 18.4.12, Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/10. Copies of Kerr's 'Memorandum on the Representation of India' are in the Curtis Papers, in the Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F. 136/10, and a draft is in the Lothian Papers, GD 40/17/3. Drafts of the article are in the Lothian Papers, GD 40/17/3 & 9. The article was published as 'India and the Empire', 2 *RT* (1912), 587-626. See also Kerr's speech of July 1912, *What the British Empire Really Stands for* (Toronto, 1912). For a fuller study of the 1912 discussion see my article, 'The Future of India in the British Empire : The Round Table Group Discussion, 1912', 3 *Nanyang University Journal* (1969), 196-204.

situation due, he thought, to the temperament of the people, the enervating nature of the climate, and India's isolation. He observed that 'Government in India has never passed the stage of the hereditary autocrat .. .'[19] His view of British government in India was that, despite its commercial origins, it had been guided mainly by concern for the welfare of the Indian people. This had led to the establishment of order and justice and to the development of modernising institutions such as schools. This paternalistic view naturally confirmed support for British rule. In Kerr's case it also served as motivation for further change. While he argued that only the British were capable of governing India at the time, the long-range goal which he envisioned was self-government on the Dominion model. In his view of future Indo-British relationships Kerr stressed the inseparability of Indian and British interests in both strategic and economic terms.

While Kerr's article looked forward to continuing slow change in Indian Government, his memorandum argued for a more rapid, though less basic, change in India's position in the Empire. For the Round Table the key question was, 'What should be the relationship of India to the proposed Imperial Parliament' ? Kerr contended that India must be treated as a special case ; its large contribution to imperial defence alone entitled to such consideration. Furthermore Indian political opinion would demand some form of representation in any new Parliament. Kerr concluded unequivocally that India should be represented in the Parliament, though in a very modest fashion. The members of the India Council might be made members, *ex officio*, or rapresentatives of India might be nominated as part of the British delegation or as special nominees of the Government of India. Kerr preferred that there be an indirect election of one Hindu and one Muslim. He thought that the Round Table should argue openly for this kind of representation, despite the probability of vigorous opposition from the Dominions, opposition which might be overcome by constitutional safeguards concerning immigration.

With these writings Kerr set the pattern for further development of Round Table interest in India. He had used ideas suggested previously by Milner and Curtis, but he had gone much further than they, especially in regard to Indian self-government. Kerr's writings

---

19. 'India and the Empire', 2 *RT* (1912), 614.

were the starting point for a series of memoranda prepared for discussion by a special 'Indian Moot'.[20] Although the minutes of the discussions are not available, the memoranda have been preserved and they provide a real sense of intellectual debate. For this purpose the Moot brought in experts on India—Meston, E. D. Maclagan, and E. Molony of the ICS and the distinguished journalist, Sir Valentine Chirol.[21] Comments are also available from two British civil servants in India, H. T. Cullis and W. H. Buchan. The memoranda are intriguing because they reveal problems inherent in the British position *vis-a-vis* India, other problems inherent in the Round Table movement, and the willingness of the Moot to canvass new ideas. On the British position there were the contradictions between British ideas of trusteeship and of dominance, and between the movement towards Indian self-government and the power and conservatism of the administrative hierarchy. Within the Round Table there was the contrast between Curtis' vision of a 'Commonwealth of Nations' and 'British Race Patriotism.' In general the Indian experts in the Indian Moot were more favourable to change in India and to Indian interests, while Craik, Malcolm, and Holland, least familiar with India, were most conservative.

On the central question of Indian representation in the proposed

---

20. Curtis, 'Confidential Memorandum', 35.5.12; letter copy, Curtis to Paterson, 18.4.12; in Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/10. The series of memoranda are: [Curtis], 'Note on Philip Kerr's Indian Memorandum.' R. E. Holland, 'Memorandum on India and the Empire', June 1912. E. D. Maclagan, 'Note on the Round Table Article', and 'Note on the Memorandum', 2 July, 1912. G. D. Craik, 'Note on the Principle of Indian Representation', July 1912. D. O. Malcolm, 'Memorandum,' July 1912. W. S. Marris, 'Memorandum on India and the Empire,' June 1912 Sir James Meston, 'Memorandum on India and the Empire', June 1912 Sir Valentine Chirol, 'Memorandum on India', July 1912. All are in the Curtis Papers; the last three are in the Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/10. The items written in India are: W. H. Buchan, 'Note on Philip H. Kerr's Indian Memorandum' 'Memorandum on the Representation of India', 11 June, 1912. H.T. Cullis, 'Note on [Green] Memorandum', 'Notes on the Indian Memoradum', E. Molony, 'Memorandum on India', 3 June, 1912. All are in the Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/10. Molony's memorandum also is in the Curtis Papers.

21. For examples of Chirol's views, especially in regard to his work as a member of the Royal Commission on Public Services, see: Chirol to Meston, 31.7.13, Meston Papers *Mss. Eur.* F 136/3; Chirol to Hardinge, 21.5.11, Hardinge Papers, vol. 81, Part I, 348-348a; Chirol to Hardinge, 12.3.13. *ibid.*, vol. 85, Part I; 116-116b. Hardinge Papers, Cambridge University Library. Chirol's books on India are *Indian Unrest* (London, 1910), and *India Old and New* (London, 1921).

Imperial Parliament, Marris, Meston, Maclagan, Chirol, and Molony agreed with Kerr. However Chirol, Maclagan, and Holland suggested that representation be comprised of representatives of the bureaucracy, the ruling princes, and the Viceroy's Legislative Council. Curtis rejected 'representation' as contrary to the principle of self-government on which membership in the Parliament was to be based, but he and Malcolm would accept Indian 'assessors' to advise the parliament. Maclagan's view was that India should be represented as a dependency, not as an equal of the Dominions. Molony suggested that Indian representation might be based on her contribution to imperial defence. Craik and Malcolm, most strongly opposed to Indian representation, argued that the Round Table case for closer imperial union rested on essential equality between Britain and the self-governing Dominions. When Malcolm considered the Pandora's Box opened by Indian representation, he recalled that the Round Table was concerned with a British Empire rather than an 'ethnological collection.' To the ICS men the situation appeared radically different. They saw Indian representation as essential because it would help satisfy the rightful hopes of Indian opinion.

The relationship of India to the Empire was a problem which revealed basic agreements and serious differences. All expressed a belief in the superiority of British civilisation and were concerned to 'raise India to our level of civilisation.' This sense of trusteeship was expressed most vigorously by Curtis and the Indian experts. On the other hand Craik and Malcolm insisted that India was in the Empire primarily for the sake of the Empire in general. Most felt that India must remain in the Empire-Commonwealth, hopefully by persuasion, though Craik argued that she might depart upon becoming self-governing.

On internal matters in India there was general emphasis on British trusteeship, and on peace, law, and order. Beyond this point there was disagreement. Meston wanted to formulate long-range goals for India, while Chirol deplored such talk as conductive to unrest. Marris, Meston, Curtis, and Kerr interpreted developments in India as having set the route irrevocably toward self-government.

In conclusion we might say that these men all recognised that India was a critical factor in the future of the Empire and that this importance must be acknowledged. Still this did not divert the Moot

from its emphasis on the Dominions.[22] Apparently neither the Indian group nor the Moot made any decision regarding the stand to be taken by the movement on India's imperial relationship. Certainly they were not, as a group, committed to early steps towards self-government. Nonetheless subsequent events showed that the 'progressive' stand of Kerr, Marris, and Meston had the most influence on Round Table thought in the following decade. Even Milner, who took less interest in India, said in 1912, that Indian loyalty to the Empire should not be underestimated and stated that

> ... changes [in India] giving a wider scope to native ability and ambition—coupled with ... a complete removal of the disabilities and indignities to which ... Indians are at present liable in some of the white communities of the Empire—would, I am convinced, effect a momentous change in Indian sentiment.[23]

Despite the Round Table's concentration on the general imperial problem, the impetus of the 1912 discussions was not lost. A final volume in the study of the Commonwealth was to have opened with a study of India.[24] This was never written, but drafts of chapters written in 1914 and 1915 are available.[25] As Curtis' study of Canada had dealt with Canadian history, these drafts explored Indian history as a means of comprehending the current and future situation of India. Both studies emphasised India's uniqueness, derived from her relative isolation and from Hinduism. In evaluating the influence of the Hindu way of life upon India, the view taken of Hinduism was almost completely negative. This was true especially in Kerr's draft, refleeting the sweeping views of civilisation which were characteristic of Curtis and Kerr.[26] Kerr contrasted the fatalism and caste-ridden

22. Another indication of Round Table interest in India was a section, 'The Administrative System of India', in the Round Table handbook, *An Analysis of the Government throughout the British Empire* (London, 1912), 160-83.

23 *Nation and Empire*, 493.

24. Curtis to Meston, 16.7.15, Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/11.

25. Two drafts of the 1914 writings are in the Curtis Papers. The first is labelled 'Marris Memorandum', April 1914 (typed and mimeographed). However, from internal evidence it appears certain that it was not written by Marris. The second is labelled 'Chirol's Draft of the Indian Chapters with his corrections thereto', [1914?] (mimeographed). They appear to be essentially the same, presumably written by Chirol, and I have treated them as one. The 1915 material was written, it seems reasonably certain, by Kerr: 'Indian chapters', 2 June, 1915 (an outline), Lothian Papers, GD 40/17/16, 462-9; 'Draft Indian chapters' (incomplete handwritten draft), *ibid.*, GD 40/17/6-7.

nature of Indian society with the self-determinative, free spirit of European civilisation. Islam in India was also considered to be fatalistic and unprogressive. The view of British rule was much more benevolent. While acknowledging its commercial beginnings both writers stress the positive role of the British presence. For the writer of the 1914 chapters the most important features were the British sense of trusteeship and the introduction of education. For Kerr the goal of British government was civilisation and liberty. In regard to education there was the usual British ambiguity, which emphasised the positive role of education but which distrusted the political views of educated Indians. Despite the critical view of Indian society both writers looked forward to Indian self-government. However there was a major difference. The first writer stressed the importance of recognising that Indian government would be *sui generis*, while Kerr's vision was that of an Asian Dominion on the British pattern. Kerr wished the British Government to declare officially that its main purpose was to prepare Indians for self-government. Though the progress towards self-government should be sure, it should be gradual, moving forward as Indians developed a sense of the individual's responsibility to the nation rather than to caste or family. While Kerr stressed the question of self-government the 1914 draft concentrated more on the question of India's relationship to the Empire. It argued that Indians must be persuaded to stay in the Empire, for India was essential to the Empire *qua* Empire, especially in strategic and economic matters. Moreover the work of government in India represented a 'higher duty' for the British. In considering the proposed new Imperial arrangements, the writer argued that India might be represented in the Parliament through membership in the United Kingdom delegation, pending the achievement of Indian self-government. The author argued that relations between India and the Dominions might be established by persuading the Indians to recognise that the question of immigration into the Dominions was *ultra vires* while the Dominions, in turn, could make various concessions to India.

The 1914 chapters may probably be taken as a fair representation of the typical views of the Round Table Moot, fairly conservative and imperial-minded, but aware that change must come. Kerr, while representing a similar cultural approach, was strongly concerned

26. Cf. Kerr, 'Political Relations of Advanced and Backward Peoples' in A. J. Grant, *et al.*, *Introduction to the Study of International Relations* (London, 1916), 14-82.

about self-government. His memorandum was apparently written before the meetings of the special 'Indian Moot' of 1915. It did not go as far in the direction of self-government as did the Moot, but its view point was consistent with the latter. Kerr's study is, then, a combination of a strong criticism of Indian society with an appeal for conscious progress towards change and self-government. In the following years the former aspect was to become less important while the latter was to play a central role in Round Table thought about India.

II

For the Round Table Moot World War I represented an ambiguous fulfilment. The war revealed an underlying unity in the Empire-Commonwealth as the Dominions and India rallied to the British side. The war also meant access for men of the Round Table to the centres of power, climaxed with Milner's appointment to the Inner Cabinet in 1916 and the appointment of Kerr and Astor to Lloyd George's secretariat. The ambiguity of the wartime fulfilment was that the war strengthened nationalism in the Dominions and India, in effect destroying all hope for effective closer imperial union.

Like many other Britons, the Moot was surprised and favourably impressed by the Indian war effort. Milner stated that he had

> some misgivings about India...But [I] was quite wrong. India has done splendidly and it seems to me inevitable that our whole attitude to India will have to undergo revision and that her status in the empire will in the future be quite different from what it has been in the past.[27]

The effect of India's wartime role was to confirm the Round Table's growing interest in India and to emphasise the question of India's future role in Imperial reform. Round Table contacts in India, primarily Meston and Marris, urged new approaches to Indian problems because of changes in Indian political thought. Two sons of Lord Selborne were in India on military duty and in early 1915 they and 'Raju', apparently an Indian graduate of Oxford, instituted a Round Table study group at Agra. This group continued as the only true

27. Milner, 'Notes for speech to United Empire Club', 25 November, 1916, 6, in Milner Papers, Vol 247, Bodleian Library, Oxford University. For permission to quote from the Milner Papers I wish to thank the Warden and Fellows of New College and Mr G. V. Bennett, Librarian of New College Unfortunately the Milner Papers contain very little on India, 1909-20.

Round Table study group in India.[28]

During the war Curtis and Kerr continued to be the most active members of the Moot and the ones most interested in India. When Kerr left the editorship of *The Round Table* in 1916 to join Lloyd George's staff, he was succeeded by Coupland, who was also becoming more interested in India. Although we know little about the views of many members of the Moot on India during the war, they were apparently sufficiently interested to support Curtis when he devoted himself full-time to Indian questions from October 1916 to February 1918.

In the summer of 1915 Selborne, Curtis, Kerr, and Hichens had conversation with Austen Chamberlain, Secretary of State for India, concerning Round Table proposals for India's role in a reformed Empire. Curtis then argued 'that the position of the Dominions in the Commonwealth cannot be settled without reference to that of the British Dependencies', and he urged Indian representation in the Imperial Conference.[29] Clearly Curtis had changed his position from that of 1912; he now thought that India must be directly involved in imperial reform. This was evident in his discussion of postwar plans.[30] During the war the Round Table assumed that after the war there would be a great Imperial Conference, when the Dominions would face Britain with demands for a real share in the foreign policy of the Empire and would themselves have to face up to the realities of Empire foreign policy, defence, and financing. Curtis argued that the British Government should appoint representative of India to this conference, one Indian and one senior member of the ICS. The next Round Table assumption was that the Imperial Conference would call a constitutional conven-

28. Meston to Curtis, 16.5.14; Curtis to Meston, 10.3.15; Meston to Curtis, May 1915; extract, letter, L. Palmer to Father (Lord Selborne), 12.8.15; extract, letter, R. Palmer to Father (Lord Selborne), 11.8.15. All items are in the Meston Collection, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/11 (titled 'Some Correspondences with Lionel Curtis). The extracts from the Palmer brothers were circulated to the Moot.

29. Curtis to Austen Chamberlain, 18.8.15; Curtis to Meston, 16 July [1915], *ibid. Cf.* 'India and the Imperial Conference', 6 *RT* (1916), 88-119; 'The New Development in the Constitution of the Empire', 7 *RT* (1917), 441-59.

30 Curtis to Meston, 16.7.15; Curtis to Meston, 25.9.15; in Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/11. For a summary of Round Table views on postwar imperial reform see Kerr, draft of a speech on 'The Imperial Constitution', 1.6.17, *ibid.*

tion to work out basic constitutional reforms for the Empire. Curtis thought that India could not be given the same type of representation as the Dominions, but again he suggested that the United Kingdom delegation should include Indian representatives. He expected that the convention would appoint a committee to study the relationship of the dependencies to Imperial foreign policy and defence. This study would persuade Dominion delegates that India could not yet be self-governing and would reveal that

> the only real hope for the future progress of the people of India towards the management of their own affair lies in the continued ability of the European communities of the Empire to maintain there the conditions of order, without which customs which now offer an insuperable bar to self-government can never be changed and unlearnt.[31]

At this stage Curtis' ingenious mind suggested a tentatives solution to the problem of arranging a voice for the dependencies in the new Imperial legislature. In a two-house Parliament the lower house, with final legislative power, could represent only the self-governing communities. In the upper chamber the self-governing communities should have equal representation and India should have the same number; while other dependencies would have smaller delegations. This would bring into effect the Round Table view that face-to-face contact is an educative experience. In supporting such a temporary solution to the problem of relating the dependencies to the Empire-Commonwealth Curtis relied on the analogy of the South African Union, when the white communities were joined and the native question deferred.

Despite the somewhat conservative stance suggested by Curtis, the Moot had been persuaded by this time that Indian expectations for postwar advance must be considered seriously. Although the Round Table often dealt in theory, it also had a penchant for working out practical schemes. To consider the future of India the Moot established a special 'Indian Moot' which met in the autumn of 1915.[32] This included a small section Moot—Curtis, Kerr, and Coupland—to which were co-opted men from the India Office—Sir William Duke, Sir Lionel Abrahams, M. C. Seton, C. H. Kisch, and J. E. Shuckburgh. Of the India Office group only Duke had the

31. Curtis to Meston, 16.7.15, *ibid.*
32. Mehrotra, *op. cit.*, 84-5. Curtis, *Dyarchy*, XX-XXIX.

extensive experience in India. The importance of these men in the India Office hierarchy, just below the level of the top decision-makers, indicated that the Round Table was following lines of thought similar to those in important sections of official opinion. This corelation became more evident in the next four years. The starting point of the Indian Moot discussions was the need for imperial reform, the members agreeing that this must he connected with the careful consideration of India's own government. The war and increasing political agitation in India had convinced them of this.

The group apparently agreed unanimously that the goal of British policy in India was self-government and

> the only meaning of self-government as a goal which bore the test of examination was responsible government for India within the Commonwealth on lines which could not stop short of those by which the Dominions had reached their present position.[33]

The group devoted itself to working out practical steps which could be taken in the direction of responsible government consistent with reasonable peace and order. There were many reasons why they turned to the provincial level for an answer. There was an increasing administrative interest in decentralisation and the Royal Commission of 1908 had recommended further steps in that direction. The South African experience had given the Kindergarten a strong orientation towards local government. More important, many of the Moot, in considering the Irish problem and the mixture of Imperial and British questions in the Westminster Parliament, turned to the idea of creating provincial governments within the British Isles—'Home Rule All Round.'[34] Finally, belief in the need for continued British guidance at the Government of India level supported concentration on change at lower levels. Since it was agreed that India lacked the educated, public-spirited electorates necessary for full self-government, the first steps had to be modest ones, but ones which would give political experience to Indians.

After original disagreement the group finally accepted the suggestion that at the provincial level there might be a modest transfer of responsibilities to Indian ministers and legislators. This idea was

33. Curtis, *Dyarchy*, xxii.

34. J. E. Kendle, 'The Round Table Movement' and "Home Rule All Round", II *Historical Journal* (1968), 332-53. F. S Oliver, *Federalism and Home Rule* (London, 1910); *What Federalism Is Not* (London, 1914). 'The Irish Crisis', 4 *RT* (1914), 201-30. Devolution was supported by only part of the Moot.

known first as 'specific devolution'; later it became known as 'dyarchy.' Popularly it has been associated with Curtis, though Duke drafted the original memorandum which represented the idea with special reference to Bengal, where he had been Lieutenant-Governor.[35] The decision in favour of 'specific devolution' was based on the view that any extension of Indian representation on Legislative councils along the lines of the Morley-Minto reforms would bring either a truly revolutionary transfer of power into Indian hands or a deadlock between an Indian-dominated legislature and a British-dominated executive. 'Specific devolution' was proposed as a step forward for it would build on Indian experience and was capable of steady expansion to complete responsible government at the provincial level. The implication was that, in time, it would also be introduced at the central level, where a similar evolution would take place. The plan suggested that, at first, a few provincial departments—education, local government, and sanitation—would be transferred to Indian hands. Subsequently other departments would be transferred, concluding with the handing over of land revenue, police, and justice. It was agreed that the provincial governments would need more regular and flexible revenues as they expanded into new field such as social welfare.

To handle these transferred responsibilities Duke suggested the formation in each province of a small Cabinet, responsible to a legislature made up of the non-official members of the provincial legislative councils. The Governor, in his relationship with these bodies, would become something akin to a constitutional monarch. The entire operation was gauged to give Indians responsibility for constructive action within well-defined spheres.

The Indian Moot, therefore, concluded with a clear statement. Self-government was the goal and certain steps could be taken soon. As to other steps the vision was conservative. The entire concept was evolutionary and pragmatic.

When we consider the Duke Memorandum in its historical context, a number of points are clear. It could not meet the expectations of most Indian leader on the other hand its proposals, though confidential, were among the first specific proposals for steps leading to responsible government. Also on the confidential level Gokhale and the Aga Khan made proposals to the Government in 1915, proposals

35. [Duke], ***Suggestions for Constitutional Progress in Indian Polity*** (London, 1916; Simla, 1917). Curtis, *Dyarchy*, 1-37.

which emphasised change at the provincial level.[36] As far as the nationalist movements were concerned, it was another year before the Congress-League Scheme, or Lucknow Pact, was agreed upon. Previous to that formulation Indian opinion was not tied to any specific proposals. In regard to British opinion the Round Table Moot was in advance of general opinion, but it soon came into closer contact with the advanced section of that opinion.

Despite the clarity of the proposal, the members of the Indian Moot and the Round Table Moot itself did not make a commitment to the proposal. It influenced thinking in the Round Table and in the British Government, but it was not put forward as a specific Round Table programme.

In the ordinary course of events the Duke Memorandum would have been circulated to the Round Table groups for study. However Lord Chelmsford, Viceroy-designate, learned of the study and indicated an interest in it. Because the Government was considering constitutional reform for India the Moot decided that the Memorandum should not be circulated but that it should be sent to Chelmsford. In the spring of 1916 the Indian Moot revised the Memorandum. Copies were sent to Lord Chelmsford in May 1916,[37] and subsequently it became part of the raw material for the Montagu-Chelmsford Report. Although the Government of India rejected dyarchy in 1918,[38] dyarchy set the pattern which was embodied in the India Act of 1919. Curtis accepted it, and it coincided with the ideas of Edwin Montagu, who became Secretary of State for India in July 1917.

III

On his way to India in 1916 Curtis visited Canada and the Antipodes. Although we do not have evidence regarding his talks with Round Table groups in these Dominions concerning India, the minutes of the Montreal Round Table Group record some consideration of India in early 1916.[39] While analysing the Round Table Studies the

---

36. C. K. Gokhale, 'Memorandum on Political Reforms by the Late Mr G. K. Gokhale', Chelmsford Papers, *Mss. Eur.* E 264/19, Part I, 75-8, India Office Library. Aga Khan, 'Note' 7.3.15, Hardinge Papers, Vol. 89, Part, I, 124a- 124d.
37. Curtis to Chelmsford, 8.9.17, Chelmsford Papers, *Mss. Eur.* E 264/19, Part I, 163-6.
38. Mehrotra, *op. cit.*, 74.
39. 'Minutes of the Montreal Group of the Round Table', 23 February, 29 March, 12 April, 1916, in Folder, 'Round Table, Montreal Group Minutes, 1916,

[Contd. on Page 495]

group touched on Indian questions. The members agreed, almost unanimously, that immigration policy should be left to the individual Dominions. Concerning the government of dependencies the group was less inclined than Curtis to emphasise the moral superiority of Europeans and more inclined to think that people should govern themselves. Some thought that India would welcome an Imperial government which included the Dominions because the latter were more liberal than Britain. This optimistic view was incorrect, as will be noted later. The Montreal group apparently agreed that Canada should help govern the dependencies. They expected that India would eventually be represented in the new Imperial Parliament.

While in Canada and Australia Curtis discussed Asiatic immigration with government leaders. Curtis' advice to Canada was clear. If a large number of Asiatics came to live there the results would be destructive both for Asians and European-Canadians. He thought that resident Asiatics should be treated like other Canadians, but he would forbid further immigration. His suggestion was that each Dominion should work the matter out with India on a *quid pro quo* basis; citizens of each Dominion should be allowed to enter India on the same terms as Indians were permitted to enter the Dominion. For the Empire as a whole he suggested a passport system. Though Curtis was committed to the idea of Commonwealth citizenship, he did not interpret this to imply free movement from one community to another.[40] Later, in 1917, he urged the Government of India to use the Imperial Conference to work out a satisfactory solution along the same lines.[41]

Curtis reached India in October 1916, an India which was the scene of political ferment. The euphoria of support for the war had evaporated and political agitation was increasing. The climax came in December 1916 when Congress and the Muslim League adopted the Lucknow Pact. This scheme outlines a framework for extending self-government, with a good bit of emphasis on provincial autonomy. It would also have expended the role of the legislative councils and

---

Meetings 1-5, 7-9', Sir Edmund Walker Papers, University of Toronto Library. I wish to thank the heirs of Sir E. Walker for permission to examine these papers.

40. Curtis to Chelmsford, 2.11.16, Chelmsford Papers, *Mss. Eur.* E 264/17, Part I, 508-508e.

41. Curtis to Sir George Barnes, Member, Viceroy's Council, 11.1.17; Chelmsford Papers, *Mss. Eur.* E 264/18, Part-I, 34-35. Curtis to Meston, 23. 1. 17, Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/11.

would have increased Indian membership in the councils. From the Round Table point of view the drawback of this scheme was that it extended the voice of Indian political groups without giving them truly responsible power. Moreover the Round Table did not think that Indian leaders or electorates were ready for the scheme. As a result the Round Table expected that the scheme would lead to a constitutional deadlock. Curtis, therefore, in his work in India in 1917, presented 'specific devolution' as a more workable suggestion.

From 1915 the Government of India and the India Office were also considering changes in Indian government. The Government of India under Lord Chelmsford suggested increased Indian participation in government at three levels : the Legislative Councils, local government, and the civil service.[42]

The extensive correspondence within the top levels of Indian government on the question of reform gave Meston and Marris opportunities to express their views. In August 1916 Meston presented a thorough statement. His basic assumption was that

> however skilled or benevolent our rule, it is an alien rule, and as such it will yearly become more difficult and its mistakes more conspicuous. A very wide-measure of self-government is the only possible solution and corrective, and it must come as soon as we can give it with any approach to safety.

However he did not consider the Indian population fit for self-government in 1916, primarily because of lack of understanding between the Indian masses and the Indian political leaders. The Government's task, he felt, was to prepare Indians for self-government by giving them 'fields in which they can practise and learn by their own failures', but in which they could not damage 'the well being of the whole community.' He agreed that advances could be made in local government, the councils, and the public service. In conclusion he argued, as in 1912, that a clear statement of policy was needed.[13] Meston's position thus put him in the liberal wing of the ICS.

In September Marris added his comments on the Viceroy's proposals.[44] Consistent with his previous statements, he suggested that fai-

---

42. Mehrotra, *op. cit.*, 73-6 Chelmsford to Meston, 20. 7. 16, Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/1, 13-17. *Cf.* Hardinge, 'Memorandum by the Viceroy upon questions likely to arise in India at the end of the war', October 1915, Hardinge Papers, Vol. 116.
43. Meston to Chelmsford, 19. 8. 16, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/1, 25-34.
44. Meston to Chelmsford, 22. 9. 16, *ibid.*, 47-9. Marris to Meston, 13. 9. 16, *ibid.*,

[Contd. on Page 497]

lure to effect positive change at an early date would be frustrating to educated Indians. He agreed with suggestions for a larger Indian role in the public services and the Councils. On the other hand he criticised the proposals to give the Councils a larger role in government, arguing that sovereignty must remain in British hands for some time yet and that these proposals would lead to a paralysis of government. Although he apparently favoured eventual responsible government for India, he did not state how he thought this should be granted.

Thus by the time Curtis arrived in India his friends were deeply involved in discussion of governmental reform. Curtis sympathised with much that they said, but in proposing dyarchy he went beyond their position in 1916 and succeeded in carrying them with him. Though Curtis was aware of political changes in India he could not appreciate the depth of feeling in Indian nationalist circles. Had he done so he might have been more cautious about the extent of his contacts with British officials. Although his aim was to contact both Indians and Europeans, his closest associations were with the bureaucracy, up to the level of the Viceroy, and with Chirol.[45] Chirol was suspect in Indian eyes because of his emphasis on unrest and his lawsuit with Tilak. Curtis refused to disavow his friends, though he came to regret the burden of his connection with Chirol.[46]

On the basis of his work in India Curtis planned to write studies on the Indian situation for the use of the Round Table groups. As part of his efforts to keep the Moot abreast of his work he drafted a long letter to Kerr in November 1916. His analysis of the Indian situation in the letter followed lines set forth in previous Round Table writings. The twin goals posited were self-government for India and a satisfactory relationship to the new Imperial Parliament. Curtis was anxious to point out how India's position on these issues was unique, and he distinguished between India and Central Africa and between India and the United Kingdom. Concerning self-government, he observed that

> Indian opinion cannot rule India, at any rate until the Indians capable of forming such opinion are united, organised,

49-57. Chelmsford to Meston, 14. 10. 16, Chelmsford Papers, *Mss. Eur.* E 264/17, Part II, 110-11.

45. Curtis Diary, 1916-21, Curtis Papers. This lists the names of many Indians and British with whom he spoke in 1917-18; it also records his travels.

46. Chelmsford to Curtis, 13. 1. 17, Chelmsford Papers, *Mss. Eur.* E 264/18, Part II, 12-13. Curtis to Chelmsford, 24. 1. 17, *ibid.*, Part I, 46-7.

> and numerous enough to exact regular, willing and continuous obedience from their fel ow country-men who have not as yet acquired the faculty of political judgment...It has to improve in quality as well as in quantity, and it must be the first business of our Government to improve both.

The special Round Table task, he said, was to make opinion in Britain and the Dominion realise this unusual Indian situation On the other hand 'We must do our best to make Indian Nationalists realise the truth that like South Africa all their hopes and aspirations are dependent on the maintenance of the British Commonwealth and on their permanent membership therein.'[47] As was his custom as 'travelling secretary' of the Round Table, Curtis had the letter printed for distribution to the Moot. Purely by accident, it appears, the letter fell into the hands of Gandhi[48] and perhaps of other Indians. When the Congress and League meetings were held at Lucknow in December edited versions were circulated. In these versions and in the rumours which attended them, Curtis was portrayed as an advocate of Dominion domination over India and as a person who thought Indians and Africans were on the same cultural level. In the heated atmosphere of the time this view, plus Curtis' contact with the ICS, give his activities the colour of a conspiratorial plot. Because of the immigration question Indian nationalists would not brook any suggestion of Dominion involvement in India.

This contretemps resulted in open criticism of Curtis and the Round Table movement at the congress session. Interestingly Meston shocked many of his ICS colleagues by officially attending the opening session of the congress meetings and a Muslim League session. Curtis accompanied him to the latter meetings.[49]

Curtis' response to the situation was to send the complete text of the original letter to newspapers throughout India, followed by a 'letter to the people of India.'[50] Because Meston and Marris were men-

47. Curtis, *Dyarchy*, 53-4. A draft of the letter is in the Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/11.
48. M. Gandhi, 'Statement on Lionel Curtis Letters', *The Indian Social Reformer*, 21. 1. 17, quoted in *The Collected Works of Mahatma Gandhi*, Vol. 13 (Delhi, 1964), 328-9.
49. Indian National Congress, *Report*, 1916, 10, 66-7; Meston's brief speech is on pp. 48-9. 'The All-India Muslim League', 18 *The Indian Review* (1917), 16. Curtis also attended a Congress session; Curtis to Chelmsford, 11. 1. 17, Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/3, 72-4.
50. Curtis, from letter to newspaper editors, 28. 12 16, *ibid.*, F 136/11. L. Curtis,

[Continued on page 499]

tioned in the letter the matter was embarassing to the Government. An official statement prepared by Meston and Chelmsford gave a short history of the Round Table and Meston's connection with it. Marris issued a similar statement. One upshot of the furore was that the Viceroy's Executive Council decreed that no Government official should belong to the Round Table or write articles for its journal. Curtis was disturbed by this decision and his relations with Chelmsford became strained.[51] In this situation Curtis found it impossible to develop Round Table groups. The Agra group continued and in one instance Lalubhai Samuldas, identified by Curtis as a Brahmin member of the Bombay Legislative Council, asked Curtis to help set up a group.[52] Apparently nothing came of it. On the other hand the notoriety brought Curtis' ideas to the attention of public opinion in all parts of India.

Despite this inauspicious beginning the year 1917 turned out to be an exciting and successful year for Curtis, comparable to 1908 when he played a catalytic role in unifying South Africa. It was a climacteric year for the Indian Government as well. The Lucknow Pact gave new vigour to the nationalist movement and there was widespread discussion of schemes for self-government. The British Cabinet, apparently at the urging of Milner, called an Imperial Conference for March 1917.[53] Chamberlain was invited as Secretary of State for India and he was assisted by a three man Indian delegation, the Maharajah of Bikanir, Sir Satyendra Sinha, and Meston. Before departing for

---

Letter to the People of India (1917). Curtis reviewed the situation in a letter to Chelmsford, 31. 12. 16, Chelmsford Papers, *Mss. Eur.* E 264/17, Part I, 576-80.

51. Chelmsford to Meston, 26. 1. 17, *ibid.*, F 136/1, 84-6. Meston to Chelmsford, 27. 1. 17 (with a draft of Meston's statement), *ibid.*, 88-91. India, *Proceedings of the Indian Legislative Council*, 16. 2. 17, 281. Curtis argues that Government servants should be free to discuss political matters and he encouraged the formation of a journal for that purpose; Curtis to Meston 31. 1. 17, Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/11.

52. Curtis to Chelmsford, 24. 1. 17, Chelmsford Papers, *Mss. Eur.* E 264/18, Part I, 46-7.

53. See papers by Sir A. Chamberlain and Viceroy, 'Representation of India at the Imperial Conference', 4 August, 1915, Lloyd George Papers, Series D, Box 24, Folder 4, No. 2, Beaverbrook Library. Kerr, as imperial and foreign policy specialist, helped Lloyd George with the agenda for the conference; Lloyd George, *War Memoirs of Lloyd George*, Vol. 1 (Boston, 1933), 1032. Gollin, *op. cit.*, 533.

London, Bikanir invited Curtis to visit him.[54] This Indian delegation made a favourable impression on the other delegates and on Lord Milner.[55] More significant, the Conference decided that India should be a permanent member of the Conference. In contrast to this welcome development, the Indo-British war effort in Mesopotamia was a fiasco; this led to Chamberlain's resignation.[56] He was succeeded by Edwin Montagu, who on 20 August, 1917, announced that self-government in the form of responsible government was the goal of British policy in India, thus paving the way for a new era in Indian history.[57] This announcement suited the vision of both the Indian nationalists and Curtis.

While the Government was working out its policy Curtis concentrated on his study plans. He travelled in the major provinces and then concentrated on the United Provinces, where Meston and Marris were serving. He spoke to many Indians, and it was in a letter to Bhupendra Nath Basu, Congress Moderate and member of the viceroy's Legislative Council, that he propounded the scheme of dyarchy.[58] Because this was the first published statement of dyarchy, it was the focus of much political discussion.[59] Following the 20 Au-

---

54. Curtis to Meston, 23. 1. 17, Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/11.
55. Milner to A. J. Glazebrook, 21. 4. 17, quoted in A H.U. Colquhoun, *Press, Politics and People* (Toronto, 1935), 269-71. See letter, Meston to Chelmsford, 20. 4 17, Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/1, 116-18
56. In 1918 Milner urged further use of Indian resources in the Middle Eastern war effort; Milner to Prime Minister, 20. 3. 18, Vol 272, Typescript of L. and M. Headlam, unfinished book on Milner, Milner Papers. Gollin, *op. cit.*, 563-6.
57. R. Danzig, 'The Announcement of August 20th, 1917', 28 *Journal of Asian Studies* (1968), 19-37. Danzig reports that Chirol may have had a hand in an early draft of the announcement. S.R. Mehrotra, 'The Politics behind the Montagu Declaration of 1917', in C.H. Philips (ed.), *Politics and Society in India* (London, 1963), 71-96. S.D. Waley, *Edwin Montagu* (New York, 1964), 132-6. For evidence of India Office consideration of Curtis' proposals see a note, [Sir T. Holderness], 25. 4. 17, with marginal note to Kerr by A.C. [Chamberlain], 27 May (1917), in Lloyd George Papers, Folder 10, Box 92, Series F, No. 7a.
58. Curtis, *Dyarchy* 31-5, 96-125. Henceforth 'dyarchy' was the term used for the proposal.
59. *E. g.* : Indian National Congress, *Report*, 1917 (Calcutta, 1918), 90-126, *passim*. Telegram to the President, [Mrs Besant], National Congress, Calcutta [December 1917 ?], All India Congress Committee Collection, File No. 1, 4a, Correspondence of Congress President Besant, Nehru Memorial Museum and Library. Letter, V.S. Srinivasa Sastri to Vaze, 14.1.18, General Correspon-

[Continued on page 501]

gust pronouncement Curtis drafted a series of 'Letters to the People of India on Responsible Government', in which he argued for dyarchy as a sound implementation of the pronouncement.[60] In the summer of 1917 he also wrote a series of 'Studies of Indian Government', dealing with the structure of government, land and revenue questions, and education.[61]

Curtis' Indian contacts included nationalists of many shades as well as a number of princes. On the British side he contacted journalists, educators, businessmen, and officials. Although many conservative Englishmen opposed his ideas, in Bengal he found a group of British businessmen and Indian leaders who were sympathetic. This group met Curtis in Round Table style to discuss his proposals. The result was a Joint Address to the Viceroy and the Secretary of State, published in November. Apparently Curtis had the main hand in drafting the Address, which proposed a scheme of dyarchy only slightly different from that set out in the letter to Basu.[62]

Because the letter to Basu set forth Curtis' proposals most clearly, we can usefully examine its key points. In comparison with the Duke Memorandum this letter breathed a liberal, pro-Indian spirit and a great sense of urgency. Curtis' general plan followed that of Duke, positing a federal model in which there would be devolution of some powers to Indian ministers and legislators at the provincial level. He laid particular stress on the adaptability of the system, on the possibility that it could be arranged differently to suit the varying conditions in the provinces. For the legislative councils at all levels he urged the removal of the official element. In regard to the electorates, he wanted a simple, clearly defined system without communal electorates, which he considered to be divisive. While Curtis expected that British control would remain in Delhi and that the British Parliament would control the pace at which self-government was extended, he expected

dence No. 189, Sastri Correspondence, National Archives of India. [Sly], 'Note on the proposals of the "Round Table" group for constitutional reform in India', in Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/11.

60. L Curtis, *Letters to the People of India on Responsible Government* (London, 1918); Curtis, *Dyarchy*, 357-466.

61. L. Curtis, *Four Studies on Indian Government* (Allahabad, 1917). With a few revisions this appears in *Dyarchy*, 201-325.

62. Pugh and Das. *A Joint Address from Europeans and Indians* (Calcutta, 1917). A copy labelled 'Note' is in the Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/11. It also appears in *Dyarchy*, 326-56. Also see letter, [Curtis] to [Meston ?], October 1917, and Curtis to Meston, 9 November [1917], *ibid.*

that there would be a steady evolution towards responsible government. Finally, he thought, at some date in the future an Indian constitutional convention could be held, similar to that in South Africa in 1908, which would take India into Dominion status. Curtis now supported Indian representation in the proposed Imperial Parliament.

These ideas represented a further step in Curtis' liberalisation on Indian questions, and he developed them in his other writings in 1917. To complete the picture of Curtis' views a few other emphases and modifications which appeared in these other writings must be noted.

In regard to provincial legislatures Curtis dealt with two special problems. Like many members of the ICS he wanted to involve the landlords in politics as a balance to the lawyers and the intelligentsia. To this end he suggested that one-third of the members of the provincial legislatures might be co-opted and that regional languages might be used. The Joint Address, moreover, called for special representation of business interests in Bengal.

His most controversial suggestion related to the geographical unit which would form the 'states' of the new federal system.[63] By mid-1917 Meston had convinced him that the existing provinces were too large; the UP for example contained a population of 48 million. Therefore he proposed that the UP be divided into four states, based on regional and linguistic factors, and that the rest of India be similarly divided. Furthermore he proposed that a narrow strip running along India's land frontier be separated from the Indian nation and be placed directly under the Viceroy as Imperial representative. This expressed his awareness that the Indian frontier was the most critical of all Imperial land frontiers. This suggestion for creating new states complicated reform proposals because it required Curtis to argue that the existing provinces continue temporarily as holders of the 'reserved' powers, those not handed over to responsible Indian ministries. Moreover it was politically unacceptable in both Britain and India, where it again raised the spectre of 'partition' recently dispelled in Bengal.

While Curtis was absorbed in the work in India his Round Table colleagues in London had little time to consider Indian problems. In order to avoid further embarrassment the journal, at Curtis' request, desisted from comment on India, except for one article in

63. Curtis, *Dyarchy*, 400-10. Curtis to Meston, 19. 9. 17, Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur*. F 136/11.

1917. This article reviewed difference between educated Indians and the British bureaucracy, and it opined that the 20 August pronouncement was a year too late.[64] *The Times* and Chirol also supported the pronouncement.[65] Unfortunately we do not know what discussions on these matters may have taken place within the Moot. As Curtis was acting as a Round Table representative, we must presume that there was no serious objections in the Moot to his line of thought.

Although Sir William Duke was not a member of the Moot he was in contact with its members. In 1917 he told Kerr that he thought dyarchy still worth considering, though he was more cautious than Curtis. The significance of his contact with the Round Table increased because of his duties in connection with Indian reform. In 1916-17 he headed the India Office committee which examined the proposals made by the Government of India and which suggested more decisive steps than those proposed. In the autumn of 1917 he was part of the team which accompanied Montagu to India and which produced the Montagu-Chelmsford Report. Finally he was a member of the India Office committee which worked out the Bill presented to Parliament in 1919.[66]

In India Meston and Marris moved ever closer to Curtis' viewpoint.[67] Marris was appointed by Meston a member of a committee to consider how reforms might be worked out in the United Provinces,[68] and in January 1918 he was selected by Montagu to be the writer of the Montagu-Chelmsford Report.

By the time Montagu and his associates arrived in India in November 1917 Curtis had laid much of the groundwork for a policy of dyarchy as a specific alternative both to the Government of India proposals and to the Lucknow Pact. Montagu held ideas similar to those of Curtis, and they had a number of talks. Despite the similarity of their general viewpoints, they came to differ on a

64. 'Genesis of the Present Situation in India', 8 *RT* (1918), 18-61.
65. *Times*, 21.8.17. By Chirol : 21.8.17, 9 8.17. *History of the Times*, Vol. 4, 843-8.
66. Mehrotra, *op. cit.*, 77-8. Duke to Kerr, with memorandum, 1.9.17, Lloyd George Papers, Folder 10, Box 92, Series F, No. 3. Duke to Kerr, 25.8,17, *ibid.*, No. 2.
67. Meston to Chelmsford, 20,8.17, Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/1, 155-9. Meston to Chelmsford, 10.10.17, *ibid.*, 171-2.
68. Meston to Curtis, 4.9.17; Curtis to Meston, 19.9.17; Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/11.

number of points. Montagu rejected Curtis' idea of sub-provincial states, and he was annoyed by Curtis' desire for haste and for a parliamentary committee to examine reform proposals. Their most serious dispute related to defining responsibilities for the two parts of the provincial governments. Curtis did not think that Montagu's proposals gave sufficiently distinct responsibilities and powers to the responsible ministers. Moreover he thought that the two governments should be separate from each other, while Montagu and his committee decided that the two should be treated as one for many purposes.[69]

Because of these differences Curtis left India disheartened in February 1918, feeling that he could not accept the proposed changes. However he left a statement of his criticism and he found that the final report was acceptable.[70] Throughout Montagu's relationship with Curtis, 1917-19, the Secretary of State had a somewhat exaggerated idea of Curtis' influence on Milner, Dawson, and Chirol.

It is not the purpose of this paper to estimate precisely the Round Table impact on the Joint Report. However the lively political publicity carried on by Curtis and the continuing association between Curtis, Marris, Mestons, Kerr, and Duke, as well as with other governmental officials, indicates that the thinking of Curtis and the Round Table was an important part of the intellectual climate which produced the Montagu-Chelmsford Report. Curtis' role was more dramatic than that of his associates because he was a sort of free-lance writer, able to publicise his views openly. Moreover his penchant for producing specific schemes and a rationale for such schemes made his work provocative and useful. As in South Africa, 1907-10, Curtis' work and that of his associates coincided with important trends in the political life of the countries involved, thus making it possible for the Round Table to play a fruitful role. In this situation, however, Curtis played a more individual hand than in South Africa, without the support of organised groups.

When we turn to other evidence of Round Table viewpoints in 1918-19, we find general support for new movements towards change

69. E. S. Montagu, *An Indian Diary* (London, 1930). Waley, *op cit.*, 143-67. Montagu's comments on Curtis and the Round Table in 1918 can be found in his letters to Chelmsford, Chelmsford Papers, *Mss. Eur.* E 264/4, Part I, *passim.*

70. Curtis to [Kerr], 28 8.18, Curtis Papers. The Montagu-Chelmsford Report is GB, Cd. 9109, (1918). East India (Constitutional Reforms). *Report on Indian Constitutional Reforms.*

in India. In June 1918 *The Round Table* came out strongly for a dyarchical solution and stated boldly that

> Parliament must in the end make up its mind what to do, do it, and go on doing it until Indians are, at length, able to assume the whole burden of responsible government for themselves. On any other terms there will be in the East an India as more tragic as it is more vast than Ireland itself.[71]

As might be expected *The Round Table* supported the Montagu-Chelmsford Report, as did *The Times* and Chirol.[72] This indicated a shift for Chirol, who had in 1916 rejected dyarchy.[73]

In Parliament the men of Round Table connections were less enthusiastic. Salisbury and Selborne refused to support the Report until Parliament had time for careful consideration. Selborne still rejected the implication that Indian self-government should be based on the United Kingdom model. Though he favoured decentralisation on principle he feared that the Report would establish a weak central government.[74]

To work out the details of the new Bill the India Office created a special Commission under Lord Southborough, with two sub-committees. The sub-committee on the 'division of functions' was headed by Justice Richard Feetham of South Africa, a member of the Kindergarten and the Round Table. The recommendations of this committee followed closely the general pattern of dyarchy suggested by Curtis.[75]

At this point, as Curtis' efforts for Indian reform were coming to fruition, he examined his future tasks as Round Table secretary. Rejecting proposals that he stand for Parliament, Curtis wavered between plunging ahead with the formal Round Table study on India or turning to the question of constitutional reform within the United

---

71. 'Indian Politics', 8 *RT* (1918), 599 (written in India). Quotations from *The Round Table* are given with the permission of the Editors.
72. 'Montagu-Chelmsford Report', *ibid.*, 778-802. 'Constitutional Reform in India', 9 *RT* (1919), 706-19 *Times :* 6.7.18, 31.7.18, 7.8.18, 19.8.18, 25.10.18. Chirol's articles in *The Times* are 6.6.18, 7.6.18, 8.6.18, 10.6.18, 10.7.18, 14.8.18. See *History of the Times*, IV, 843-8. V. Chirol, 'Constitutional Reform in India', *Quarterly Review* (1918), 401-21.
73. Chirol to Kerr, 27.7.16, Curtis Papers.
74. GB, *H. L. Debates*. Salisbury : 26.7.18, 1216-18; 6.8.18, 609-12; 24.10.18, 876-8. Selborne : 24.10.18, 834-45.
75. GB, Cmd. 103, Cmd. 141, Cmd. 176 (1919), Southborough Committee, *Report*.

Kingdom.[76] In fact he turned his hand most effectively to the Irish question, helping to bring about the settlement of 1921. He never completed his study of India.

It was the Round Table members of Parliament who were most involved in Indian questions in 1919. Salisbury continued to oppose reform but he was no longer an active member of the Round Table. Selborne supported the establishment of a joint parliamentary committee to examine the proposed India Act, and he became its chairman. In the process of this work he was persuaded that dyarchy was the appropriate instrument for decentralisation and for training Indians in self-government. He stated in the House of Lords that the principles which guided his committee were these : remove as many points of friction as possible; eliminate all 'sham' constructions; fix responsibility clearly; give power equal to responsibility; place the Government of India clearly under Parliamentary control.[77] All these were principles which Curtis had emphasised many times. In the final debates on the Bill no other Round Table men participated, though Lady Astor, an 'unofficial' member of the Round Table Moot, raised the issue of women's suffrage in India.[78] When the Draft Rules to carry out the Act werepresented to the Lords in 1920, Salisbury voted against them, while Milner, Astor, and Meston supported them.[79]

Dyarchy may have been a real opportunity for a major step towards Indian self-government. Tragically it coincided with the passage of the Rowlatt Acts and the Amritsar 'massacre.' These events ruined any possibility that the new Act would be supported by the Indian National Congress. To complete the picture of Round Table views on India, it will be useful to examine their views on these developments of 1919. In this case the Round Table did not speak as clearly as it had on constitutional reform. It had always felt that the British Government must maintain order. On the other hand the Round Table liberals argued that political activism should not be equated with sedition.[80] Actually we have little evidence concerning

---

76. Curtis to [Kerr], 28. 8. 18, Curtis Papers; this is an extensive review of Round Table activities concerning India. Kerr to Curtis, 10. 9. 18, *ibid.*
77. GB, *H.L Debates*. Salisbury : 30. 6. 19, 1139-45. Selborne : 12. 12. 19, 1004-16, 1041-42. GB, Common Paper 203 (1919), *Report from the Joint Select Committee on the Government of India Bill.* Curtis' evidence before the committee is in *Dyarchy*, 482-552.
78. GB, *H.C. Debates*, 4. 12 19, 656-7.
79. GB, *H.L. Debates*, 15. 7. 20, 208-18.
80. Meston to Chelmsford, 20. 8. 17, Meston Papers, *Mss. Eur.* F 136/1, 55-9.

Round Table views on the Rowlatt Acts. In Parliament Selborne supported them and we may presume that the conservative members of the Moot, at least, agreed with him.[81]

In regard to General Dyer's action at Amritsar the most interesting material appears in the House of Lords debate on the Government's action concerning Dyer. Milner, as Secretary of State for the Colonies, was the Government spokesman. Naturally inclined to support the 'man on the spot', he explained that he was persuaded by the evidence that Dyer's actions grossly exceeded the limits of sound policy and were likely to incite further unrest. Meston agreed with Milner while Salisbury said that 'rebellion is the greatest crime.' Salisbury and Selborne voted for the motion criticising the government's action; Milner, Astor, and Meston were on the opposite side.[82]

IV

The Year 1920 marked the end of a chapter in the history of the connection between the Round Table and India. Moreover it was the end of the Round Table organisation as a cohesive movement; henceforth Dominion nationalism moved the Commonwealth away from closer union, while the Round Table men changed some of their views and shifted their interests. Only a few members of the Moot continued a close association with India. Most notable of these were Kerr, who became Under-Secretary of State for India, 1931-32, and was chairman of the Indian Franchise Committee in 1932,[83] Coupland, who served as occasional government consultant on India and wrote books on the subject,[84] and Meston.

These changes make the years 1909-20 a closed period for the topic of this study. As has been shown, during this time the Round Table Moot moved away from indifference and ignorance about India to extensive involvement. The Round Table ended by accepting a

81. GB, H.L. *Debates*, 12. 12. 19, 1015.

82. *Ibid.*, 20. 7. 20, 311-18, 344-53, 367-78. For comments by Milner, as Secretary of State for the Colonies, on Indians in East Africa, see *ibid.*, 14. 7. 20, 157-67. Meston was created Baron Meston in 1919; in 1918-19 he served as Finance Member of the Viceroy's Executive Council. In 1920 he was chairman of the committee on financial adjustments between the provinces and the centre.

83. His correspondence on Indian matters, 1931-33, is in Lothian Papers, GD, 40/75. Amery was Secretary of State for India, 1940-45, but he was not an active Round Table member after 1914.

84. He served on the Royal Commission on Civil Services in India, 1923, and on the Cripps Mission, 1942, and he was adviser on Burma for the Round Table Conference in 1931. In the 1940s he wrote six books on India.

unique role for India in its vision of the Empire-Commonwealth and urging the view that the time had come for significant movement towards self-government. The reasons for this change have been suggested in this article, through further light may yet be shed on the matter. The contacts with Marris and Meston provided an opening through which an interest in India could be fostered. More directly, the very imperialism of the Round Table led it to new views about India. The desire to make the Empire more effective brought it to consider how the growth of unrest in India could be overcome and how India could be related meaningfully to imperial reform. More dramatically, Curtis' image of the Commonwealth left no room for doubt that India must some day become a self-governing part of the Commonwealth community. Wartime developments hastened the pace of all these changes. In this connection Curtis observed in 1918 that

> Before I left England [for India] the Indian moot cured me of the view that the Indian question could, like the native question in South Africa, be postponed till after union was accomplished. The war at any rate was obliging us to face the question whether or no the principle of the commonwealth was applicable to India... only one answer could be given to that question.[85]

Kerr's role was also critical, perhaps because he, more than any other member of the Moot, was deeply interested in relations between peoples of different cultures.[86]

In considering the impact of the Round Table interest on British imperial history, the point has been made here that the Round Table, especially Curtis, played an important part in the development of the India Act 1919. It helped prepare the leaders of British public opinion to accept such a change. In this the Moot was in tune with other movements of the day. Its influence was especially evident upon *The Times*, the Conservative Party, and the Government of India. In India itself the impact was more contradictory. In the perfervid political atmosphere of 1917 and 1918 Curtis' proposals were a centre of debate. On the other hand its long-range impact on Indian thinking was not very significant; much of the impact was negative and the modest successes of dyarchy did not help make Round Table ideas popular. The failure to establish a network of Round Table groups in India is

85. Curtis to Kerr, 28. 8. 18, Curtis Papers.
86. This was illustrated by his visit to the United States in 1909 to study race relations there. He also played a part in developing the mandate idea of 1919.

significant evidence of this lack of interest. Because the Round Table was unique in its development of Dominion-wide study groups, it would be interesting to know if groups in South Africa, Australia, New Zealand, and Canada changed their views on India during the period under study. That question must await futher research.

In conclusion a quotation from one of Curtis' letters to the people of India expresses both the general orientation of the Round Table Moot and its vision of India's future :

> ...troublous as the times before us may be, we have at last reached that stage of our work in India which is truly consonant with our own traditions. In the past our task has been that which other great Empires have accomplished. We may well be glad to feel that in our generation has begun the work of remodelling the Government of India on those principles which all free nations have borrowed from England, and which most of them have now combined to defend... No human work is perfect, but the foundations of responsible government in India have been firmly laid by our predecessors. Yet finer qualities will be needed in raising the walls; and the task is one worthy of this epoch in our history, if only because it calls for the effacement of ourselves.[87]

87. Curtis, *Dyarchy*, 466.

Obituary

Maharaja Yadavindra Singh of Patiala

With the death of His Highness Lieutenant-General Maharaja Yadavindra Singh on June 17, 1974, at the Hague in Netherlands, comes to close the last chapter of the history of the ruling house of Patiala.

Maharaja Yadavindra Singh was ninth in the line which began with *Baba* Ala Singh, the founder of the Patiala *Rāj*. Ala Singh was the third son of Chaudhri Rama, one of the seven sons of Phul from whom the Phulkian Sikh confederacy of the eighteenth century derived its name. Phul had been blessed by Guru Har Rai with power and plenty saying that 'the steeds of his descendants shall drink water as far the Jamuna' and they shall have sovereignty for many generations [Macauliffe, iv, 94]. The two brothers *Bhai* Rama and his elder brother *Bhai* Tiloka, the ancestor of the Jind and Nabha families, were devoted disciples of the great *Guru* Gobind Singh and he had called upon them in his letter of Bhadon 2, 1753 Bikrami, August 2, 1696, to join him with a force, evidently, to meet the menace of the then feared invasion of Anandpur by Emperor Aurangzeb's son Prince Muazzam on his way to Kabul. It was in this letter that the great Guru had blessed them saying, "I am much pleased



with you. Your house is my own—*merī tere upar bahut khushī hai, Terā ghar merā hai ... Terā ghar merā asai.*"

This document, known as the *Hukam-nama*, is securely preserved in the Qila Mubarak, Patiala, as a priceless heirloom.

The two brothers also helped Banda Singh Bahadur, the first liberator of the eastern Panjab, with men and money in his early exploits (1709-1716).

Baba Ala Singh (1691-1765), the founder of the Patiala ruling house, was a man of saintly bearing, a brave soldier, a shrewed politician and a patriot of the first water. In spite of the Sikh-Mughal tension in the Panjab, then at its worst, he co-operated with the Mughal forces in the battle of Manupur in 1748 when Ahmad Shah Durrani was defeated. He helped the Marathas with food and fodder in 1760-1 in the battle of Panipat. He was a close associate of Sardar Jassa Singh Ahluwalia in the conquest of Sirhind and its allied territories in 1764 and purchased the town from Bhai Buddha Singh, to whom it was assigned by the Khalsa. During his seventh invasion of India (1764-5), Ahmad Shah Durrani treated *Baba* Ala Singh with great respect in recognition of the high position that he had attained among the Sikhs and bestowed upon him a drum and a banner—*tabl-o-alam*—as insignia of royalty. His wife Mai Fatto was a lady of exceptional humility and loved to supervise a free common kitchen, *Guru ka Langar*, which she ran for the poor and needy.

After his death in 1765, Baba Ala Singh was succeeded by his grandson, Amar Singh, who received from the Durrani king the title of *Rājā-i-Rājgān*. With the help of Sardar Jassa Singh Ahluwalia and other Sikh Sardars from the trans-Sutlej Panjab, he successfully pulled through his struggles with the Bhattis, the Marathas and the Mughal government of Delhi and expanded and consolidated the territories of the Patiala State. In 1781, Maharaja Amar Singh was succeeded by his seven-year old son, Maharaja Sahib Singh. The administration of the state, however, was run for sometime in his early days by his heroic sister, Sahib Kaur, who successfully rolled back by her gallantry in the field of action near the village of Rajgarh, in 1794, the Maratha expeditionists and saved Patiala and its neighbourhood from the ravages of these adventurers.

Afraid of the rising power of Maharaja Ranjit Singh, who wished to expand and consolidate the kingdom of the Panjab up to the right bank of the Jamuna, the cis-Sutlej chieftains, including Maharaja Sahib Singh of Patiala (1782-1813), sought the protection of the British Government of India who within a few years established their sway up to Ludhiana on the left bank of the river Sutlej. Maharaja Karam Singh (1813-45) helped the British in 1814 in opposing the Gurkha expansion into the Punjab hills and secured an addition to the Patiala State. The death of Maharaja Karam Singh on December 23, 1845, and the succession of his twenty-one year old son, Maharaja Narindar Singh, took place during the days of the first Anglo-Sikh war (December 18, 1845—February 10, 1846). The most important event of his period (1845-1862) was the great Indian Mutiny of 1857, which, among other things, aimed at the restoration of the Mughal Emperor Bahadur Shah II. The people of the Panjab, particularly the Sikhs, as history knows it, had suffered very heavily at the hands of the Mughals in the previous century. At one stage Emperor Bahadur Shah I (1707-12) had issued a royal edict on December 10, 1710, ordering an indiscriminate massacre of the Sikhs wherever found, saying : *Nānak-prastān rā harjā kih bayāband ba-qatl rasānand.* This edict was repeated by Emperor Farrukh-Siyar in almost the same words with the result that for over forty years the executioner's sword worked havoc and the Sikhs in their thousands fell under it. They could not then live in their villages and had to leave their homes and hearths to seek shelter in sandy deserts, thick jungles and mountain defiles. And, they had to fight vehemently for decades together to uproot the Mughal government in the Panjab to return to their homes. They could not, as such, be expected or persuaded to take up the cause of the Mughal emperor at the instigation of the Poorbia soldiers of the Bengal Army who, along with their other comrades of the British Indian army, had helped the British destroy the last Indian independent kingdom of the Panjab in 1845-6 and 1848-9, hardly eight years ago. The Maharaja of Patiala, along with many other Indian chiefs, at this time, helped the Government of India maintain peace and order in northern India.

Maharaja Narindar Singh died on November 13, 1862, and was succeeded by his son, Maharaja Mahendra Singh (1862-76), who was a great patron of learning and works of public utility and is known for his interest in the general well-being of the country. He spent millions of rupees on the Sirhind Canal project, contributed seventy

thousand rupees to the University College at Lahore, paid a lac of rupees for the relief of the famine - stricken people of Bengal, and founded in 1875 the Mahendra College at Patiala for the promotion of higher education in the State. This was the only college in this part of India which imparted education free of any charge right up to the post-graduate stage up to 1933 and attracted hundreds of students from other parts of the country. The noble work of Maharaja Mahendra Singh was continued by his son Maharaja Rajindra Singh who came to throne in 1876 and died in November 1900 at the age of 28.

Maharaja Bhupendra Singh, born in October 1891, was only nine years old when he succeeded his father. He developed into a first class sportsman, an astute politician and an able administrator, and he was responsible for giving Patiala a prominent place not only on the political map of India but also on the sports map of the world. He was an international figure in polo and cricket. He was practically a life-chancellor of the Chamber of Princes and attended the War conference in London in 1918, and in 1928 he presented the Indian Princes' case before the Indian States Committee. He was also selected as one of their representatives at the Round Table Conference in London in 1930. He was a great patron of art, education and literature, and his collections of historical and artistic interests were highly admired by those who saw them. His collection of medals belonging to great historical personages all over the world was next only to that of the king of England.

The efforts of Maharaja Bhupendra Singh in the cause of the Panjabi language, which he raised to the position of Court language as early as in 1910, won for him the admiration of one and all. It was at his suggestion that the first Gurmukhi type-writer, called the Bhupendra type-writer, was manufactured by the Remingtons. The *Encyclopaedia of Sikh Literature*, the *Mahan Kosh*, of Bhai Kahan Singh was published by his princely donation of seventy thousand rupees.

Above all, he always felt proud of his great Sikh heritage. Sir Michael O'Dwyer, in an obituary of the Maharaja published in the *Times*, London, tells us : "When seeing him off at Lahore Railway Station on a roasting day in May 1919, on his way to N.W. Frontier to take part in the third Afghan War, I begged him not to run any undue risks, his gallant reply was : '*Sahib*, I am a Sikh and must live and die as a Sikh'."

Maharaja Bhupendra Singh died in 1938 and was succeeded by his son, Maharaja Yadavindra Singh. Born on January 7, 1913, Maharaja Yadavindra Singh was only twenty-five years old when he was called upon to shoulder the responsibility of ruling the state of Patiala at a critical period in the history of India But he had been so educated and trained by his far-sighted father in different departments of the state government as to equip him to be able to understand the intricacies of administration, and he was fully prepared to handle any type of situation that he had to face in the days to come.

His early education began at home under the personal supervision of his parents and was then sent to the Aitchison College, Lahore. After obtaining his diploma in 1930, he accompanied his father to England on the occasion of the first Round Table Conference. During his wide and extensive travels in Europe, he met great politicians, big businessmen and other greatmen of international fame. He also visited libraries, museums and historical monuments which filled his mind with noble ideas and high ideals.

Returning home, he was sent to the Police Training School at Phillour where his sense of discipline, punctuality and hard work, and living like a commoner among his fellow-trainees, won for him the admiration of one and all. On the completion of his course, he was appointed Suprintendent of Police, Patiala District, in which capacity he not unoften led his men personally against armed gangs of notorious dacoits. Unafraid of any risks, he would jump into the most dangerous encounters with them, and his indomitable courage always won the day for him. In 1933, he was promoted to be Inspector General of Police of the State and in that high position he would himself undertake to do things which others would have left to their subordinates. He was also appointed a member of the Committee which was to run the administration of state during his father's absence on a long tour abroad.

He was on his way to Quetta to serve his attachment to the 2nd Royal Battalion of the 11th Sikh Regiment for military training when that place had the worst shock of an earthquake on May 31, 1935. It was suggested that he might return to Patiala. Undeterred, he spurned the suggestion and rushed to Quetta and reported for duty. The town was then a big heap of ruins with as many as forty thousand men, women and children lying burried under its debris. With tearful eyes, their helpless relatives looked to the army for relief. Unmindful

of the dangers involved in the work, the Heir-apparent of Patiala, Yadavindra Singh, with untiring energy and sympathy, joined hands with other officers in the rescue work and earned the respect and admiration of all who saw him working with his own hands among the corpse-full debris of the ruined city.

After his returning from Quetta he was attached for further training to the Second Patiala Infantry in the State forces where he rose to be a Lieutenant-General at the age of 33.

Later, he was appointed Secretary to the Government in the Forests and Horticulture Department. Here he busied himself with exploring the possibilities of extensive fruit cultivation in the Patiala State, particularly in the sub-tropical region of Kohistan. As President of the Flood Relief Committee and of the Quetta Earthquake Relief Committee, he worked to his fullest capacity in the collection of funds and supervision of relief aids.

With all this varied experience in police, military and civil branches of administration, coupled with social and humanitarian service to the distressed and needy people in and outside the State, *Yuvarāj* Yadavindra Singh developed a keen insight and a sympathetic mind, always looking to the welfare of the people around him. This was the 'Yuvi' (*Yuvarāj*) of His Highness Maharaja Bhupendra Singh as he, at times, called him and who came to throne of Patiala after him in 1938. On April 19, 1938, His Highness Yadavindra Singh was formally recognized as the Maharaja of Patiala by the Government of India through a *Kharitā* wherein His Excellency the Viceroy and the Governor General of India conveyed to him His Majesty the King Emperor's pleasure in recognizing his succession to the throne. In replying to the speech of Sir Harold Wilberforce Bell, Resident, Punjab States, who represented the Viceroy of India on this occasion, H.H. Maharaja Yadavindra Singh said :

> "...And today on this solemn occasion, I say in all sincerity that I shall consider it my primary and paramount duty to devote myself wholly and unremittingly to the service of my people, of the Empire and of India..."

And true to his word, the Maharaja dedicated himself to the service of his people and of India throughout his life. He was a happy mixture of conservative views and modern ideas. He would not reject things simply because they belonged to the olden days, nor was he afraid of them because they were new. He valued everything according to its merit and usefulness. A devoted Sikh himself, he was

above narrow communalism. To him all good Sikhs, Hindus, Muslims and Christians were worthy of regard and respect. State darbars were held not only on the occasions of Dussehra but also on the Muharram and *Id* days. This engendered cordial and friendly relations between the various sections of the people of Patiala. Many Hindu temples, Muslim mosques and Sikh Gurdwaras and Deras received regular contributions from the Patiala State.

Luxuries and pleasures, which not unoften made some of the princes of his days a nuisance to the people, he had none. He lived a life of piety and austerity, with only unexpensive and useful hobbies. He was a great sportsman, with cricket as his first love. He hated flattery and detested wasteful ostentation. He was a strict disciplinarian and he attended his office regularly and punctually and disposed of his files without any delay, with the result that his ministers and heads of departments invariably followed his example. In the absence of Prime Minister, he was his own Prime Minister and he took over all his portfolios and looked after the work of several departments with direct touch with secretaries to the Government and the heads of department. And he was easily accessible to those who wished to see him in connection with any official or private business.

With a view to effecting economy in the state expenditure, he began with a marked reduction in his own Privy Purse which was fixed at a surprisingly low figure as compared to that of his father. His aeroplanes were sold and about 150 motor-cars from the royal garrage were auctioned. Most of the lands, bungalows and palaces in British India, which were his personal property, were disposed of and the proceeds of all these sales and auctions were credited to the State treasury and not to his personal account. For the same purpose many an unnecessary post in the top-heavy administration and personal establishment were abolished.

On May 22, 1938, Maharaja Yadavindra Singh issued the order to abolish the Game-preserves, known as *Bir*, in eleven villages and towns. These had not only converted large tracts of cultivable land into waste-land but the wild animals living therein were also the cause of incalculable harm to the crops in the neighbouring fields. This measure, said His Highness' order, "was culculated to promote the welfare of our beloved subjects." A scheme for the consolidation of agricultural holdings was also put in force along with the establishment of the Rural Development Department and Rural Uplift

Committees to ameliorate the condition of the agriculturists in the villages.

On the Public Health side, medical facilities were improved and enlarged, specially for maternity cases, and a Touring Dispensary was set up to serve the people in distant villages, far away from hospitals and dispensaries in cities and towns. Not only this. To protect the people from the use of injurious vegetable ghee, the import duty on it was doubled. A Ghee-Grading Station was established at Narnaul under a Government Chemist to test Ghee and other articles of food and drink. An act was also passed to prevent juveniles from smoking, ordering that if a minor were found smoking in a public place he might be stopped from doing so, the tobacco and cigarettes in his possession might be seized and destroyed.

To look after the welfare of soldiers, ex-soldiers and their families, District Soldiers' Boards were organized all over the State, with the Central Soldiers' Boards to promote and maintain good relations between the military and civilian classes.

The development of trade and industries as well had its due share of His Highness' attention. The productive capacity of the Bhupendra Cement works at Surajpur, at the foot of the Simla Hills. was enlarged and, with the construction of new residential quarters for the workers of the factory, a small beautiful town arose on the place. Chandigarh-Surajpur quarries were put to more economic and profitable use. The work at the Narnaul mines was entrusted to an enterprising private firm.

Up to 1937, the town of Patiala alone had been electrified and the rest of the State used earthen lamps with sarson-oil or kerosine-oil lanterns and lamps. His Highness took in hand the electrification of almost all the towns with electric speed with liberal grant of licences for the generation and supply of electric power on commercial basis. The repair of old roads was placed on the top of the P.W.D. programmes and the private road to Ghagga was thrown open for public traffic.

To stem the tide of rising prices owing to the outbreak of World War II, and to meet the panic of famine spread by hoarders, profiteers and black-marketeers, Maharaja Yadavindra Singh ordered on September 10, 1939, that till further notice all essential commodities should continue to be sold at pre-war prices. At the same time, he advised his subjects to report unhesitatingly all cases of excessive prices to the police who were authorised to take immediate action

according to law. Five weeks later was appointed a Central Board to regulate and fix prices of food articles and oils, fuel, medical supplies, etc., etc., with total prohibition of the export of food grains from the State.

On the outbreak of the world war in 1939, the Maharaja founded the Khalsa Defence of India League which sent thousands of stalwart Panjabis to join the colours. He also personally went to the Italian theatre of war and to the Middle East and Malaya.

He became a leading light in the politics of the Indian Princes soon after he became the Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes in 1943. When after the failure of the Cripps' Mission in 1942, the British Government sent to India the Cabinet Mission under the leadership of Lord Pethick Lawrence, the Maharaja of Patiala was not unoften the central figure in the negotiations. He was the head of the Princes' delegation that met the mission on behalf of the Indian States. He was also a member of the Negotiations Committee of the Princes which, under the Cabinet Mission Plan, was to negotiate with the representatives of British India the terms on which the states would accede to the Indian Union, Many a hurdle was placed in the way of negotiations by some of the reactionary princes who were looking for an opportunity to sabotage the Cabinet Mission Plan. The efforts of Maharaja Yadavindra Singh, with unshaken devotion to the cause of Mother India, with the co-operation of a number of patriotic princes, however, succeeded in keeping the majority of the princes united on the side of the Indian Nationalist leaders.

There was a long tussle between the Indian National Congress and the Muslim League over participation in the Interim Government set up before the formal declaration of the independence of the country. Frustrated in their designs, the Muslim Leaguers on July 29, 1846, decided to embark upon Direct Action for the achievement of a separate Muslim State—the Pakistan. At the same time, they let loose a violent Direct Action propaganda of hate and hostility against the non-Muslims in the Muslim-majority areas, both in the east and the west of the country. And, it worked such a havoc throughout the land in the shape of wholesale massacres, indiscriminate arson and loot, organized abduction and rape of women, etc., as would put the misdeeds of Hulakoo and Changez to shame.

Discussions between the Negotiations Committee of the Chamber of Princes and the States' Committee of the Constituent Assembly passed through very anxious stages on February 8 and 9, 1947, and

it was feared that the reactionaries among the princes might sabotage the participation of the States in the Assembly. It was at this critical moment that, in the words of the *Tribune* of February 11, "The Maharaja of Patiala saved the situation" and "succeeded in frustrating the plot that had been hatched" by them for the purpose.

Patiala was one of the first princely states to decide on March 13, 1947, to participate in the Constituent Assembly and to send up its representatives as members This gave a healthy and encouraging lead to many a wavering state which soon followed in footsteps of Patiala and took part in the Consembly.

The arrival of the new Viceroy, Lord Mountbatten, in March 1947, with the decision of the British Government to divide the country into Hindustan and Pakistan, put entirely a new complexion on the politics of India. At this stage a very dangerous proposal aimed at further division of Hindustan was set afloat in princely circles, suggesting the creation of one or more separate independent federations of Indian States. A number of ruling princes were easily taken in. A word from Maharaja Yadavindra Singh in their support would have created a situation which even the great Iron-man of India, Sardar Vallabh-bhai Patel, would have found difficult to control. But once again the Maharaja of Patiala rose to the occasion to save the situation. He not only refused to associate himself with further division of the country, but also, on the other hand, stood up like a Himalayan rock to oppose it. He gathered to his side a number of patriotic princes and so moulded their opinions as to bring them in line with his own views to oppose the proposed creation of the States' federation. This saved India for all time to come from a permanent source of weakness and danger from within and without.

On August 1, 1947, twenty-two rulers of states, with Maharaja Yadavindra Singh leading, signified their decision to accede to the Indian Union and others followed in quick succession. This was a great triumph for the Maharaja of Patiala and Sardar Patel who were able to accomplish for the unification of India something unique in the history of this great sub-continent.

On August 15, 1947, India was declared to be independent, with West Pakistan and East Bengal cut out of her sides to create the Muslim state of Pakistan.

The birth of Pakistan caused the severest of pangs to Mother India. While thousands of her non-Muslim children were mercilessly butchered in the West Pakistan and lakhs of them were driven out

of their ancestral homes and hearths at the point of dagger, lakhs of her Muslim children were torn away from her lap under dreadful circumstances to reside in the newly created country. This was the inevitable result of the Muslim League propaganda among their masses.

Some indications of the coming events had come from the speeches of the League leaders. As early as the beginning of April 1946, Malik Sir Feroze Khan Noon had said that "the havoc which the Muslims will play will put to shame what Halaku did" [*The Tribune*, Lahore, April 11, 1946]. And Halaku (Hulagu) Khan is known to the history of the world as one of the most cruel and remorseless destroyers of human life and property. Sardar Abdul Rab Nishtar said in August 1946, months before the blood-thirsty dagger was actually unsheathed, that "Pakistan can only be achieved... if need be, and opportunity arose, by shedding the blood of others. Mussalmans are no believers in the creed of *ahimsā*. We will just do as the situation demanded" [*The Tribune*, August 18, 1946]. According to Raja Ghazanfar Ali's statement [August 31, 1946], they were to wait "until the fire-order comes from Qaid-i-Azam Jinnah" [*Civil and Military Gazette*, Lahore]. On September 4, Khan Iftikhar Hussain Khan of Mamdot, President of the Punjab Provincial Muslim League, appealed to the Muslim lawyers "in the name of Islam and Pakistan ... to spread out all over the province, in every village, *qasba*, town and city, and to do preliminary spade work of propaganda without which no revolutionary upsurge and determined struggle is possible" [*The Dawn*, September 5, 1946]. Even the Qaid-i-Azam Mr Muhammad Ali Jinnah, thought of civil war as an effective method to coerce his adversaries to agree to the demands of the Muslim League. Preparations and training for a blood-bath therefore continued in the autumn and winter months and the fire-order was given in December, as a trial to begin with, in the predominently Muslim district of Haripur Hazara. There could be no doubt about the success of the fire and sword operations there against the helpless small minorities of Hindus and Sikhs who were taken unawares and were driven away with heavy losses in life and property.

So horrifying were the wholesale murders and loot of the non-Muslim in West Pakistan at the instigation of the Muslim Leaguers that God-fearing Muslims felt shocked to see them. One of them, Shaikh Akbar Hussain of Ravi Road, Lahore, wrote in a letter published in the *Civil and Military Gazette* on October 10, 1947:

"Are these murders sanctioned by Islam ? Is this butchery allowed by Islamic laws ? Is this killing of women and children in accordance with the rules of *Shariat* ? Well, I dare say, these acts are against Islam and *Shariat*." No religion permits this. But political murderers and looters know no religion.

The government of the Panjab was also then Muslim-dominated. Nobody was there, therefore, to help the non-Muslims. Thousands of Hindus and Sikhs were thus rendered homeless, with no place to go to for shelter. Robbed of all their belongings, most of them had nothing to live on or to cover their half-naked bodies. The Government of India simply looked on, dazed and confused. It was at this critical moment that Maharaja Yadavindra Singh came to the help of the helpless and made his historic announcement welcoming the distressed refugees to come and settle down in Patiala where they would be given all possible facilities. The refugees looked upon this as a God-sent offer through the benevolent agency of His Highness Maharaja Yadavindra Singh and, in response thereto, they poured into Patiala in their thousands, beginning with the second week of March 1947. The number of refugees in Patiala city camps soon rose to 25,000.

With a view to relieving pressure in Patiala, camps were also opened in several other towns of the State and an appeal for funds for the Refugees' Relief Funds was made by the Prime Minister of the State with a donation of Rs. 2 lakhs from the Maharaja himself. The public responded magnanimously to this appeal with the result that the amount received by way of donations rose to Rs. 3,17,927-3-8. The number of refugees in camps other than those in Patiala and its neighbourhood and Sirhind went up to 24,806 and, according to ***the Report on the Working of the Relief and Rehabilitation Committee, Patiala,*** from April 8, 1947, to February 25, 1948, the Patiala State spent Rs. 16,40,526-10-6 on relief and rehabilitation of urban refugees in addition to the expenditure on the resettlement of rural refugees on land in the villages of the State.

Not only this. The Ladies' Club under the inspiring lead of Maharani Mohindar Kaur rendered great service to the refugees in collecting and distributing clothes and other immediate necessities of life, in addition to personal supervision of ***Guru ka langar*** in different camps. In fact every one in Patiala did his and her best to contribute all that could be done for the comfort of the displaced persons in their hour of need.

As a result of the conference of the Sikhs held at Patiala on October 22, 1947, with a view to mobilizing the scattered energies of the community for safe-guarding their interests in different fields, an organization under the name of Panthic Darbar was set up with Maharaja Sahib as its President. It was welcomed not only by the rulers of the Panjab States and by leaders of political parties but was also blessed by religious men like *Sant* Randhir Singh of Narangwal.

With the declaration of the independence of India as Sovereign Democratic Republic, the process of democratising the erstwhile princely states began with the accession thereto of over five hundred of them. The state of Patiala was originally recognised as a separate viable unit, but as the union of the other seven other smaller states appeared not to be endurable, the formation of the union inclusive of Patiala came to be suggested. The Maharaja of Patiala volunteered to make whatever sacrifice was involved in the formation of the bigger union, and the convenant therefor was signed by the rulers of Patiala, Jind, Nabha, Faridkot, Kapurthala, Malerkotla, Nalagarh and Kalsia on May 5, 1948, including the provision that Maharaja Yadavindra Singh would be the first *Rajpramukh* of the Patiala and the East Panjab States Union. The Union was formally inaugurated on July 15, 1948, by Sardar Vallabh-bhai Patel, the Deputy Prime Minister of India, who in the course of his inaugural address said :

> I must mention the notable contribution which H.H. the Maharaja of Patiala made to the unity and integrity of India. He took up the cause of the country at a time when there were few friends amongst the Princely Order and when serious attempts were being made to balkanise India by means of one or more Rajasthans It was his patriotic lead that contributed in a large measure to a change in the attitude of the Princes to the problem of accession to the Indian Dominion. I acknowledge the ready and willing help which the Rulers have given me in implementing the policy of integration and democratization. This involved on their part considerable sacrifice and self-denial. For all this I am most grateful. I am particularly happy to associate myself with the inauguration ceremony of the Patiala and the East Punjab Sates Union as this is the last celebration of its kind. It marks the coping stone of the arch which the Government of India with the co-operation of the Rulers and the States-people, has built to contribute towards the stability of the country's structure. It now remains with the people to utilise the

tremendous opportunity that lies before them. The Future is now with the people; they themselves can make or mar it.

The Patiala and the East Panjab States Union came into actual existence a month and five days later when Maharaja Yadavindra Singh took over the administration of the Union as its *Rajpramukh* on August 20, 1948.

On this occassion the people of the Panjab were rightly happy and the Premier of the Panjab Government, Dr Gopi Chand Bhargava, presented to him an address on behalf of the Hindus and Sikhs of the country as a token of their deep affection and reverence for him. Among other things, the address said :

> At a very critical stage in the freedom movement of India the Indian States under the wise guidance of Your Highness assured the British Cabinet Mission in May 1946 that the Indian States fully share the general desire in the country for the immediate attainment by India her full stature. ...Again it was the wise statesmanship of Your Highness that gave the lead in the matter of the accession of Indian States to the Dominion of India. ...
>
> In the recent tragic circumstances, a still greater proof came when Your Highness threw open not only your State and all the resources at your command, but also your heart to the afflicted victims of communal frenzy in the West Punjab. When all was darkness, when everything that they had possessed had been lost, when they found themselves without succour and without hope, when they had suffered indescribable and inhuman brutalities, when even the faith in the future had been shatterred, Your Highness was the first to extend a ray of hope, and offered to stand by them, and give an assylum to the homeless and the afflicted. The Refugees from West Punjab were provided with means to stand up again on their legs and they were settled on land and in various avocations of life. You grudged no expense, you spared no effort, you moved amongst them freely, offering them solace and succour. Your noble example restored confidence in human nature and gave them courage. No words can express the gratitude of those who received help and assistance at your hands, or the admiration of others who have watched it from far and near. We feel proud that a Punjabi Prince has accomplished all this single-handed.
>
> Inspired by your love and care, the Patiala army, every soldier and commander of which is distinguished and is outstanding for

his personality, courage and discipline, was the first to strike terror in the hearts of the savage and bloody Kashmir raiders, and turn them on their heels.

You were one of the few Indian leaders to whom the woefully suffering refugees of Kashmir hopefully appealed to save them from harrowing diseases and their fast spreading destruction. As the leader of the Panthic Darbar, you at once sent a fully equipped medical mission to Kashmir, which has nursed and saved the lives of thousands of destitute Kashmiris.

Finding the Government of India fully absorbed in receiving and rehabilitating the streams of rural and urban refugees pouring in from the West and the East Pakistan, and many of its military units deployed for their relief and resettlement in different parts of the country, leaders of Pakistan thought it to be the most opportune time to take forcible possession of the State of Jammu and Kashmir in violation of the Standstill Agreement into which they had entered with it. According to a communique of the Kashmir Government of October 17, 1947, armed people from Pakistan had created disturbances in the Poonch and Mirpur-Khas areas and that further trouble was apprehended on the Jammu-Pakistan border. Complaining of the unfriendly attitude of Pakistan in not allowing the working of the Standstill Agreement, the Kashmir Government told the Governor-General and Premier of that country that in the case of the continuance of this attitude of Pakistan, "Kashmir would be justified in asking for friendly assistance" [*Reuter*, *CMG*, Oct. 20, 1947].

A strong column of Pakistani raiders backed by their army-men drove down the Domel road on October 20, 1947, hoping to be in Srinagar on the 26th. But they wasted some days in their looting operations on the way. Then they were also held back by a small brave contingent of about 150 men under Brigadier Rajendra Singh of the State forces. On October 25, Maharaja Hari Singh of Jammu and Kashmir sent an SOS to the Government of India apprising them of the critical situation there. The plea for immediate military aid was supported by Sheikh Mohammad Abdullah, the popular leader of the Kashmir people. On October 26, Maharaja Hari Singh signed the instrument of the accession of the Jammu and Kashmir State to India. The State thus became a part and parcel of India and its defence against foreign aggression became her responsibility. On receipt of an urgent message from the Government of India, Maharaja Yadavindra Singh responded to the call for millitary aid to the Jammu and Kash-

mir State with his proverbial quickness. Detachments of Patiala troops were immediately flown to Srinagar, and before reinforcements arrived they were able to check the first onrush of the Pakistani invaders who were ultimately driven back, and Kashmir was saved. But politicians at times commit blunders in proportion of their bigness. The Pakistanis were on the run and Indian soldiers were pursuing them at close quarters when the cease-fire was ordered. If it had only been delayed by a couple of days or so, the Kashmir State would have been cleared of the raiders and the Kashmir problem would have been practically solved for all time to come.

The Patiala and the East Panjab States Union, popularly known as the PEPSU, was destined to live only for eight years, two months and eleven days, and on November 1, 1956, it was merged with the East Punjab. But, as ill-luck would have it, the new Panjab came to be sub-divided on linguistic basis ten years later on November 1, 1966, with the state of Haryana carved out of it, in addition to some areas of the Hoshiarpur district transferred to the Himachal Pradesh.

The establishment of a University at Patiala had been on the programme of the PEPSU Government. But the dream of His Highness the Rajpramukh and Sardar Gian Singh Rarewala, the Prime Minister of the State, came to be realized on April 30, 1962, when the University Act passed in the Panjab Legislative Assembly, with the active support of its chief minister Sardar Partap Singh of Kairon, came into force. The Punjabi University, Patiala, was inaugurated on June 24, 1962, when, at the same time, a two-volume ***Abhinandan Granth***, printed on silk, was presented to Dr Bhai Jodh Singh, the first Vice-Chancellor of the University. Professor Harbans Singh, M.A,, PES (I), then on deputation from the Punjab Educational Service as Officer on Special Duty and Secretary to the University Establishment Committee, was appointed as its first Registrar.

In 1965 His Highness went to Italy as an ambassador of the Union of India, He was then induced in 1966 to enter into the politics of the Panjab as a member of the Legislative Assembly. But he soon realized that this was not the right step for him to take. He had been brought up in a different atmosphere. Trained as a straightforward gentleman, a disciplined soldier and sportsman, and an honest and strict administrator with a sympathetic outlook, he could not reconcile himself to the trickeries and intrigues of professional politicians. He, therefore, wisely and quitely, left politics to devote himself to constructive service of his community as President of the

Guru Gobind Singh Foundation established in 1964 by Shri Ram Kishan, the chief minister of the Panjab, and himself, and later of the Guru Nanak Foundation established in 1965.

With his abiding interest in sports as chairman of the All-India Council of Sports and as honorary life-President of the Asian Games Federation, he was closely associated with the Olympic movement in India and many other social and cultural activities in the country. He headed the I.O.A. from 1937 to 1960. The establishment of the National Institute of Sports at Patiala was mostly due to his efforts. He had been the Pro-chancellor and Chancellor of the Chamber of Princes and India's delegate to the 11th session of the U. N. General Assembly in 1956-57. He also attended the UNESCO conference in 1958 and the FAO conference in 1959.

Thrice was he elected the president of the Sikh Educational conference and he presided over its annual sessions at Patiala (1949). Delhi (1952) and Indore (1961); and, for many years he continued to be the Patron of the Khalsa College, Amritsar, the premier educational institution of the Sikhs.

Since November, 1971, His Highness Maharaja Yadavindra Singh was India's Ambassador to the Netherlands at the Hague where he died suddenly of heart attack on June 17, 1974. His body was flown to India via London, and was cremated with full state honours on the 21st at Patiala in the family crematorium, the *Shāhī Samādhān*. His ashes were immersed in water at Patalpuri at Kiratpur on the 24th, and the last religious ceremony, the *Bhog* of *Sri Guru Granth Sahib* in his memory, was performed at the new Moti Bagh palace at Patiala on the 26th, when glowing tributes were paid to him for his manifold services in the cause of the motherland. He leaves behind him his wife Maharani Mohindar Kaur, his two daughters and two sons, Amarindar Singh and Malavindar Singh.

GANDA SINGH

Book Reviews

The Partition of the Punjab by Dr. Kirpal Singh, pub. Punjabi University, Patiala, 1972, pp. 188, price Rs. 11-60.

'The Partition of the Punjab' was a doctoral thesis of Dr. Kirpal Singh. It aimed at analysing the genesis and results of the partition of the Punjab in 1947. He has very ably examined the various plans considered by the different political parties, and has highlighted the role of the partition machinery, such as, the Punjab Boundry Commission, etc., and has finally brought out the causes of the large scale population migrations from one part of the erstwhile province to other in the newly formed dominions of India and Pakistan. The main utility of the book lies in the presentation of all the details and data then available on the subject, viz., Proceedings of the Partition Council, the files of the East Punjab Government and, above all, the information collected by Dr. Singh personally from a large number of British and Indian statesmen and officials who were intimately concerned with the shaping of things and events at that crucial stage of India's history. The book is on the whole well-planned though, at places, the information given is rather sketchy, particularly in the first two chapters.

There is a great scope for studying and analysing the events which had slowly and imperceptively built up a case for the ultimate vivisection of the country as a result of the policy of the British to play one community or interest against the other for the furtherance of their imperial interests. In the Punjab, the British had started the game of divide and rule as soon as the British Resident was allowed a say in the affairs of the Lahore Darbar after the Anglo-Sikh war of 1845-46. He insisted in bringing to the fore the rights of the Muslims to say *azān* in the mosques and also removal of ban on cow killings, with the clear aim of winning over the sympathies of the Muslims. This policy was carried to its logical conclusion soon after the annexation of the Punjab. In his secret despatch dated 7th April, 1849, to the Court of Directors, Lord Dalhousie openly advocated the policy of creating divisions among the various communities

of the erstwhile Lahore Kingdom, and also the likely cooperation he would receive from the Muslims. There is enough recorded evidence to prove that the British never completely trusted the Sikhs, although they exploited their zeal, and loyalty, particularly in the armed forces.

To my mind the major contribution made by Dr. Kirpal Singh in his thesis is to bring out, in bold relief, the part played by the Sikh leadership in thwarting the design of Mr. Jinnah of getting the entire Punjab included in Pakistan. One is also left with the impression that the demand for a Punjabi Subha or the Sikh Home Land was neither seriously made by the Akalis nor taken seriously by either the Congress, the Muslim League, or even by the British authorities. However, it is difficult to agree with Dr. Singh that the formation of a Coalition Ministry in the Punjab in 1946, by the Congress, the Unionist Party and the Akalis 'gave an unnatural twist to the Punjab Polities.' There was to my mind, nothing unnatural in the Akalis, the Unionists and the Congress, who were all opposed to the partitioning of the country, to have formed a Ministry with a view to preventing the Muslim League from controlling the Government of the Punjab for the first and at the most crucial time. As was evident from the attitude of Mr. Jinnah, the Muslim League, having then firmly committed itself to partition, could not afford to soften its attitude to the non-Muslim in the Punjab, except at the peril of its newly won popularity among the Muslim masses. Moreover, the announcement of a dead line by the British Prime Minister Attlee had brought the Indian politicians face to face with stern realities, and, under these circumstances, every political party had to make a tough bargaining whether for good or evil. At that stage to avoid partition of the country, or of a single province like the Punjab, would not have been less than a miracle.

The Akali Party even failed to get the fringe concessions for the Sikhs due to the intransigence of Mr. Jinnah and the luke-warm attitude of the British authorities. One would have liked to know the role of the Arya Samaj as well, though less conspicuous than the Akali Party, in those days. A detailed bibliography given at the end has considerably enhanced its value as a reference book.

M. L. Ahluwalia*

* Asstt. Director, National Archives of India, New Delhi.

Administrative Aspects of Medieval Institutions in India by K. P. Dutta, pub. M/s J.K. Enterprises, 73, Mahatma Gandhi Road, Calcutta, 1972, pages 314, price Rs. 15/-

The book consists of the following five chapters :

I. The Importance of marriage issue on the Question of Succession under the Turko-Afghans,

II. Razia Begum,

III. The Genesis, Growth, Power and Importance of Sultan in Medieval India,

IV. The Role of Nobility under the Sultanate of Delhi,

V. The Institution of slavery and its Administrative Impact.

These chapters cover very important issues confronting the Muslim Government in India under Turko-Afghan rulers. The plan followed by the author is topical and this is the only proper plan of writing a book on institutions of a particular period of history. Despite the paucity of reliable and balanced sources of information about the period under study, the author has certainly taken lot of pains to gather relevant material that could be of value to the students as well as teachers. The book reveals the author's capacity to use the contemporary or semi-contemporary works. He has kept himself sufficiently above the level of being an opponent of the Muslims or an apologist and a supporter of the Hindus who had in certain respects suffered at the hands of the Sultans of Delhi. His approach is balanced.

These essays have been written logically and they grow to their full dimensions in his deligent hands. He is able to project a full picture of the problems that he presents. The author bases his conclusions not only on chronicles written by Muslim scholars but takes into account the writings of the contemporary Hindu scholars as well. He keeps before him the religio-political philosophy of the Muslim scholars that influenced their judgement while writing history.

He writes that Dr. I. H. Qureshi's book, *The Administration of the Sultanate of Delhi* which is a work of an outstanding merit, needs to be further evaluated. His feeling about Qureshi's work is not incorrect as the latter considers that all the institutions introduced by the Sultans of Delhi were ideal, perfect, flawless and fairly secular, and to that extent Qureshi is questionable and at places K. P. Dutta has correctly differed with him(Qureshi) basing himself on facts.

In his first essay the author writes that the Sultanate of Delhi adopted no uniform policy or principle in regard to succession as

this question was very elastic in the earlier stages. It seems that the major principle, if it could be called a principle, was that of 'might is right'. Nomination of a successor by a ruler was, no doubt, an important factor but generally the choice fall on the eldest son. In this essay the author has brought out the various aspects of the marriage issue on the question of succession. The author rightly feels that succession issue is a very vital aspect of the political and administrative history as it accounted for frequent rise and fall of the dynasties.

In the second essay entitled Razia, the author says that under her the institution of kingship was more clearly defined. She exhibited unique energy to fight against the nobility. She also fought against those who called in question the legal validity of Razia's accession to the throne. The author has successfully endeavoured to show that she was a rare diplomat and unmatched in the early medieval history of India. The author quotes instances of high watermark of her shrewdness and political diplomacy. She became an institution herself and she was the path-finder who explored the possibilities of Muslim kingship. He concludes that Razia's sex was a positive disadvantage to her and all her other qualities could not outdo the single factor of her being a woman.

In the third chapter the author traces the genesis, growth, power and importance of the Sultan. In due course of time the office of the Sultan was divorced from its religious character. Legally the political and religious authorities in the Islamic state were in different hands but the Sultans had unofficially assumed control over the both. Attempts were made to bifurcate them. The religious side was looked after by the Ulama and the administrative side managed and supervised by the Sultan. The powers and functions of the Sultan were not clearly defined. But the ruler exercised tremendous powers.

In actual practice the Sultan was not a secular ruler, rather he was the chief warden of the faithful and as such protected the faith. The Sultan was also the administrative head of the state and the commander of the army. This study discusses in detail the various aspects of the Sultan's office.

In the fourth chapter the hard-working and painstaking author traces the origin, racial composition, the growth and the demands of the nobility for their rights and privileges in the early medieval India.

In the fifth and the last chapter the author gives an account of the institution of slavery and its administrative impact. He traces the origin of slavery to a period long before the advent of the prophet. The author treats in details the merits and demerits of this system laying special stress on the role of the administrators and the rulers that this institution produced.

The book as a whole is very useful for students, teachers and general readers of medieval Indian history in so much as it provides abundant material arranged in proper form. The author has power of critical acumen and ability to harness the opinions of various old and modern historians.

Printing is deplorable. Even if the author could not pay proper attention to the reading of proofs, with a little care on the part of the publishers and printers, many a mistake could have been avoided. The author has added a long bibliography that speaks for his deep scholarship and linguistic equipment necessary for writing advanced essays on medieval history of India. The book provides a very useful and absorbing reading.

BHAGAT SINGH*

Love is Stronger Than Hate: A Remembrance of 1947, by Dr Khushdeva Singh, pub. Guru Nanak Mission, Patiala, 1973, pp. 117, Rs. 4/-

We have had it from some of our best story-wirters, Manto's *Toba-Tek Singh* and Madeem Qasmi's *Parmeshar Singh* among them; they related how the angel in the man was victorious over the brute in the man. Here a Sikh doctor relates, not a story—though it looks like a story—but his own experiences, how in the midst of over-all fanatic atmosphere, when everything was burning in the fire of communalism, he saved his Muslim brethren.

A doctor, by the very nature of his profession, must be a humanitarian and a liberal to the very core. But how many we can find ? (I personally know one of the many friends of the writer whose communications have been entered into the appendix portion of the book, and who happens to be in the same profession; I know that his complaints all the time are that Muslims of the town don't visit him while they go in hordes to this Hindu doctor and that Hindu doctor.)

The 'story' is about the 'dark days of 1947 when madness had overtaken people on both sides of the new partition line dividing our

*Head of the Deptt. of History, Govt. Mahendra College, Patiala.

country into dominions of India and Pakistan.' The place is Dharampore, a small town in the Simla Hills, situated at a distance of about 16 miles from Kalka on the Kalka Simla road, and know for its sanatorium for the treatment of tuberculosis. Dharampore faced the problem when the refugees from west Punjab poured into the town and the places around. Barring a few person—who were killed because of their possessions—the Doctor was able to save not only the entire Muslim population of Dharmpore but even those living in nearby townships of Dagshai, Subathu and Kassauli. And the original letters reproduced in some 80 pages of the book bear testimony to the place Mr Khushdeva Singh has been accorded in the hearts of those whose lives were saved only by this man of God.

The narration is in an interesting style, and one wishes the narrative part were not limited to 30 odd pages only. Two, somewhat long passages, I would like to cite to give you a glimpse of the type of material the book contain : Passage 1 is regarding the actual operational activities; and passage 2 is a thrilling memory of the welcome accorded to the Saviour when he visited Pakistan :

"I then called a meeting of the leaders of the Muslim community and apprised them of the situation. They too had sensed the danger and said that they were willing to leave next day, September 8, 1947, if I could arrange for two trucks to take them to transit camp, and for providing protection for their safety on the way. I agreed to their proposal, after which they left. The date for their evacuation was set, but I was not sure yet as to whether these people were to be sent to Kalka where the Govt. had started a regular camp for Muslim evacuees of the hill area, or to Subathu, where the Muslim population of that place and the surrounding area had collected and started a camp of their own. After giving a serious thought to this problem, I decided in favour of Subathu, as the distance between Dharampore and Subathu was half that between Dharampore and Kalka and the Muslims at Subathu had some sort of protection from the military regiment stationed there. I informed the leaders of the Muslim community and they also welcomed my decision. ... Next day two trucks arrived at about ten o'clock in the morning. The Muslims were getting ready to leave. It appeared as if all would go well. But it was not to be. I got the disturbing information that some of the refugees and miscreants had blocked the road from Dharampore to Subathu at four different places with tree trunks and coaltar drums. Some refugees were also seen moving about near those blockades.

I was further informed that the truck drivers had been bribed.

"All my plan was upset. I went home in great distress. I wept and prayed to God to show me the way so that I could be helpful in saving the lives and honour of these people. For a time it all looked dark, and then a flash of thought came which gave me a ray of hope. Why not send them to Dagshai which was only four miles from Dharampore. It was situated in a different direction. There was a direct road between Dharampore and Dagshai, and there was no Muslim camp there. Nobody was thus likley to forestall the move. The other advantage was that Degshai was a cantonment where their protection was more or less guaranteed.

"The truck drivers were also to be changed. I sent one of my trusted men to Dagshai with a message to a friend that he might kindly send to me two truck-drivers in plain clothes immediately.

"The scheduled time for departure arrived. All were ready. The refugees were pressing me that I should ask the Muslims to get into the trucks. The Muslims were also getting a little suspicious as to why I was delaying their departure. But I was waiting for the new pair of truck drivers. It was about 3 p.m. when the truck drivers from Dagshai arrived. I sent the original truck drivers to my hospital on some pretext. As soon as they were gone I asked the Muslim residents to get into the trucks. And they all men, women and children got in within a few minutes. I then called the truck drivers who had come from Dagshai and quietly told them to take their seats behind the driving wheels and take the trucks to Dagshai. As the trucks moved in that direction, everyone including the Muslims in the trucks were surprised as to what had happened. In this way all the Muslim residents of Dharampore were transported to Dagshai without the loss of a single life."

Another scene : (Visit to Pakistan) :

"The first halt was Jodhpur where one passenger, a Muslim, boarded the plane, and occupied a seat near me. He was a complete stranger to me, and without any introduction began to say ... 'Sirdar ji you must be an unwanted member of your family that you are going to Karachi.' I was taken aback by this remark. Yet I gathered myself and said, 'Yes Sir, I am an unwanted member of my family but you need not bother about me.' I then sat quietly but it set me thinking. Then the plane reached Karachi.

"There I saw a crowd of people, men and women, some of the latter in Burqa waving their handkerchiefs at me. As I stepped out,

the first man to greet me was Mr. Abdul Wakeel Khan, Superintendent of Police, who was posted at the airport. He touched my feet and greeted me : 'How are you, uncle?' I took him in my embrace. In the meantime, the Muslim passenger, who had emplaned at Jodhpur, came out. The police constables pounced upon him as soon as he came out. I did not know what was happening. Abdul Wakeel Khan told me : 'Uncle, he is a smuggler, and we are tired of him. Today we will teach him a lesson.'

"My friends took me to a room at the airport where we all sat down and talked and talked. Then we all had our lunch together. I had to travel from Karachi to London by a KLM plane which was scheduled to arrive at 2-30 a.m. I had therefore to stay there for about twelve hours. We had our tea at 5 p.m. and I told my friends that they had given me so generously of their time. I thought it would be too much for them having to wait the whole night and suggested that they must spare themselves the trouble. But nobody left until it was dinner time. We ate our dinner together. Then they said that they were leaving and that I must have a little rest before emplaning. I closed the door and went to sleep, but all of them, as I learnt later, had not gone anywhere. They only moved to the adjoining room and stayed there. I got up at about 1-45 a.m. and, when I opened the door, I saw that all of them were still there. They had retired only to give me the chance of having some sleep. They all accompanied me to the plane, and before parting, presented me with a small basket of grapes."

One only wishes many more accounts like this should be publicised so that the fact become clearer that the world of God is not the monopoly of the brutes alone. Accounts written by Subadhra Joshi in *Secular Democracy* are another example. Somebody should also collect the accounts related by the workers of Shanti Sena and other peace corps working in the country since 1947 uptodate. The episodes related by these sincere patriots will enrich our literature to the extent nothing can do in the present atmosphere of suspicion and doubt.

Major Khushdeva Singh should be congratulated for pioneering the series of work mentioned above. He has succeeded in engraving on our hearts the central theme of the book which, incidentally, is so appropriating, the finishing touch of the story : 'Love is stronger than hatred, love is far stronger than hatred, love is far stronger than hatred at any time and anywhere." And it reaches its apoge in the last line : "It was thousand times better to love and die than to live and hate."

Something difficult to act upon, no doubt, almost impossible. But, is it not a fine ideal worth striving for ?

A.R. BEDAR*

Azādī dī Shamā de Sikh Parvāne by Man Singh, pub. All-India Sikh Council, New Delhi. 1973, size 20×30/16, pages 212, price Rs. 5/-.

The book *Azādi dī Shamā de Sikh Parvāne* is the result of author's deep study of not only the history of the Sikh freedom fighters of the Punjab but also of India. He has specially studied the history of Punjab from the origin of the Sikhs to the present day. He has made a careful selection of the Sikh freedom fighters who laid down their lives for the independence of the country. Guru Nanak, the first Guru, says Man Singh, showed the path for independence by criticising and condemning the tyrannical rulers of his day and raising his voice against the invasion of India by Babur. The 5th, 6th, 9th and 10th Gurus followed the same path. The writer has also pointed out that it was really a great achievement of Guru Arjan to give a foreign policy to his Sikhs by sending some of them to Kabul for trade in horses. After the death of Maharaja Ranjit Singh, his son Maharaja Duleep Singh tried his best for the independence of the country. The role of Sikh freedom fighters in the struggle for India's Independence, like Kartar Singh Sarabha, Baba Kharak Singh, Maharaja Ripudaman Singh of Nabha, Udham Singh, etc., has been highlighted by the author. In this thought-provoking and life-inspiring book, wherein he has also given brief accounts of the Namdhari, the Akali and the Babar Akali movements.

Some very useful information regarding the origin, development and achievements of the I. N. A. under the leadership of General Mohan Singh has also been given.

It gives what may be regarded as a more or less lop-sided picture of the period with more emphasis placed on the role of the Punjabis, whom he regards to be the real pioneers of the independence of the country. The author has made this attempt with a view to giving due place to Sikh freedom fighters of the Punjab.

The book seems to have been produced in a hurry and a large number of misprints have marred its readability.

Devinder Kumar Verma†

*Director, the Khuda-Bakhsh Oriental Public Library, Bankipur, Patna
†Department of Historical Studies, Punjabi University, Patiala.

Nirukt Sri Guru Granth Sahib by Dr Balbir Singh, pub. Punjabi University, Patiala, 1972, vol. 1, pp. 412, price not mentioned.

Dr Balbir Singh, the author of the above *Nirukt*, is a renowned scholar of oriental and occidental religions, with mastery over several languages. This is clearly evident from his above work on the etymological dictionary of the Sikh scripture.

To begin with, the origin of each word mentioned in the *Nirukt* is traced to its parent language, with all its variants used in different places and context in the *Guru Granth Sahib*, giving the relevant verses in different *Rags* and *Mahalas*. In most cases the varaints are treated as separate entries to leave no doubt about their meanings when used in different sense and context. For example, the word *Amrit* occuring in different places, at times with different spellings, has been explained under thirty-three entries (1271-1303) on pages 259-67. Whenever necessary, the learned author has discussed a word at considerable length as, in a subsequent volume, in discussing the word *Abhich*, he has with the help of astronomical data determined the date of the visit of Guru Amar Das to Kurukshetra [also *see the Panjab Past and Present*, vol. VIII-II, pp. 342-45].

As such it may be safely said that this *Nirukt* should prove a most welcome enterprise in the field of Panjabi literature. The Bibliography and index given at the end will be of great help to scholars in the study of Sikh religion and Panjabi langnage and literature. How we wish there had been no occasion for the *errata* appended after page 412. This will, however, help remove the effects of the intrusion of the printer's devil here and there.

The get-up and general printing of the volume is very good. The Punjabi University, Patiala, deserves full praise for undertaking this laudable project which is likely to cover as many as twenty such volumes.

GANDA SINGH